

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 1946 of 2020

1. Ashok Kumar Agrawal, S/o Late Kishanlal Agrawal Aged About 62 Years
2. Kishore Kumar Agrawal, S/o Late Kishanlal Agrawal, Aged About 58 Years

Both Resident Of Sundarganj Ward, Bastar Road, Dhamtari, Tehsil And District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Ministry Of Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, Capitol Complex, Nawa Raipur (Atal Nagar), Raipur, Chhattisgarh
 2. Board Of Revenue, Circuit Court Raipur, G.E. Road, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
 3. Shri Omprakash Tiwari, S/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari
 4. Shri Pawan Kumar Tiwari, S/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
 5. Shri Satish Kumar Tiwari, S/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
 6. Shri Ritesh Kumar Tiwari, S/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
 7. Ku. Janki Tiwari, D/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
 8. Smt. Premlata Chaturvedi, D/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
 9. Smt. Prabha Mishra, D/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
 10. Smt. Meena Dubey D/o Late Shivkumar Tiwari,
- All Resp. No. 3 to 10 Resident Of Tiwari Bada, Bastar Road, Dhamtari, Tehsil And District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh
11. Shri Ramlal Agrawal, S/o Late Handulal Agrawal, Aged About 82 Years, Resident of Sundarganj Ward, Bastar Road, Dhamtari, Tehsil And District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

-----Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Ankur Agrawal, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Siddharth Dubey, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

17.09.2020

1. The limited relief that the petitioner has sought for in the present writ petition is for a direction to the Respondent No. 2 to decide the revision cases pending between the parties bearing Revision Case Nos. RN/04/R/A-6/33/2019 and RN/04/R/A-6/34/2019 which are connected revision petitions at the earliest.
2. This contention of the counsel for the petitioners is that the revision petitions arises out of a mutation proceedings which were initiated by the petitioners way back in the year 1996-97 and therefore considering the period consumed in the course of litigation proceedings, the respondents may be directed to decide the matter as expeditiously as possible.
3. The State counsel does not have any strong objection to the limited relief that the petitioner has sought, however submits that the reason for the delay seems to be some civil suit pending.
4. Considering the relief sought for by the petitioners, this Court is of the opinion that ends of justice would meet, if the writ petition is disposed off directing the Respondent No.2 to decide the aforementioned two revision petitions as early as possible considering the fact that the mutation proceedings had been filed way back in the year 1996-97.
5. With the aforesaid observation/direction, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge