

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2382 of 2020**

1. Sumed Singh S/o Udraj Singh Aged About 34 Years

2. Devlata Singh W/o Sumed Singh Aged About 32 Years

Both R/o Village Kanjipani, P.S. Pali, Tahsil Pali, District Korba Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, Nawa Raipur Chhattisgarh

2. Collector District Korba Chhattisgarh

3. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Cum Administrator For Rehabilitation And Resettlement Katghora, District Korea Chhattisgarh

4. Satyanarayan Singh S/o Late Gambhir Singh R/o Village Kanjipani, Chaitma, Tehsil Pali, District Korba Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Shri N. Naha Roy, Advocate

For Respondents/State : Ms. Richa Shukla, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order

25/11/2020

- The limited grievance of the petitioners in the present writ petition is that the petitioners are the resident of Village:Kanjipani, P. H. No. 23, Chaitma, Tahsil and Police Station: Pali, District: Korba, (C.G.). The land which is now under acquisition for the purpose of widening and construction of the Bilaspur-Katghora N.H. No. 130 belonging to the petitioners.

2. The contention of the counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners have been residing in the said village for a period of more than 40 years, they have been living with the little agricultural work over the said land. According to the counsel for the petitioners, under the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred as “the Act, 2013”), the petitioners fall within the category of an “affected family”. They are therefore entitled for compensation as also for appropriate rehabilitation and resettlement. It is also the contention of the counsel for the petitioners that they have already moved before the concerned Sub-Divisional Officer for suitable compensation and rehabilitation benefits under the said Act of 2013, which the authorities may consider in accordance with law at the earliest.
3. Learned Deputy Government Advocate on the other hand opposing the petition submits that except for the contention of the counsel for the petitioners, they are in occupation of the land for a period of more than 40 years. There is no document or any proof to establish their right over the said piece of land. According to the petitioners, the land from the pleadings reflect to be owned by the Respondent No. 4 and the Respondent No. 4 is the person who has been notified in the award for receiving the compensation, therefore, the petitioners as such do not have any right whatsoever for claiming any compensation or any benefits under the Act, 2013.
4. Be that as it may, since the petitioners have already approached the Sub-

Divisional Officer for an appropriate decision on the application for grant of compensation and other benefits under the Act of 2013, the writ petition at this juncture stands disposed off, directing the Respondent No. 2 and 3 to take an appropriate decision in accordance with law within a period of ninety days from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case, the respondent-authorities are expected to take a decision purely in accordance with law governing the field. The petitioner would also be at liberty to approach the Respondent No. 2 and 3 for deferring of the releasing of compensation to the Respondent No. 4 pending his application before the authorities.
6. With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Ashu