

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 225 of 2021

1. Shiv Narayan Bajpai S/o Late Shri Pratap Narayan Bajpai Aged About 70 Years R/o Gond Para, P. S. City Kotwali, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
2. Smt. Jagdamba Wd/o Late Shri Udho Prasad Mishra Aged About 70 Years R/o Village Amarkantak Road, Gourella, Tahsil Pendra Road, District Bilaspur Now District Gourella-Pendra-Marwahi Chhattisgarh
3. Smt. Shivrani Shukla W/o Shri Manmohan Shukla Aged About 60 Years R/o Balodabazar, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Public Works Department, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Secretary, Revenue Department, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
4. Sub Divisional Officer/Land Acquisition Officer Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
5. Sub Divisional Officer/Land Acquisition Officer Bilha, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
6. Municipal Corporation Bilaspur Through Its Commissioner Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
7. The Executive Engineer Public Works Department, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri A.S. Rajput, Advocate
For Respondent/ State	:	Ms. Richa Shukla, Dy. G.A.
For Respondent No. 6	:	Shri Sandeep Dubey, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

22.01.2021

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the land of the petitioners bearing Kh No. 601/13 were acquired by the respondent authority for construction of road namely ring road No. 2 and thereafter despite the land was acquired no compensation was paid. He further submits that the petitioners through their mother have initially filed an representation in the year 1996, subsequently another representation was filed in the year 2010 and lastly on 14.09.2020 to the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Bilaspur. It is contended that the said representation may be decided in accordance with law.
2. Learned State counsel opposes the argument on the ground that the writ petition is grossly belated.
3. Perused the documents.
4. Considering the time lapsed in between as of now without any observation on merit, it is directed that the petitioners would be at liberty to file a fresh representation to Respondent no. 3 & 6 within a period of 4 weeks from today and if such representation is filed it is directed that the same shall be decided in accordance with law.
5. With the aforesaid observation, the petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge