

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 688 of 2021**

- Hamesh S/o Jaykumar Aged About 23 Years R/o Village- Suloni, Tahsil- Pusour, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Collector Janjgir, District- Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
3. Sub-Divisional Officer (Revenue) Dabhara District- Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
4. Tehsildar Dabhara District- Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Surfraj Khan, Advocate

For Respondents/State : Shri Gagan Tiwari, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****09/07/2021**

Heard.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the parties jointly submit that the issue raised in this writ petition is squarely covered with the decision rendered by the coordinate bench of this Court in Writ Petition (C) No. 51 of 2016 (*Pradeep Sharma Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others*), decided on 24.02.2016, therefore, this writ petition may be disposed of in terms of paragraphs 4 & 5 of the aforesaid order, which read as under:-

“4. The issue whether issuance of notice would be necessary to the party in whose favour the order, sought to be reviewed, was passed, need not detain this Court any longer because principles of natural justice has been violated. The order which was sought to be reviewed and in respect of which permission was obtained from SDO was admittedly passed in favour of the petitioner. Therefore, exercise of review undertaken under Section 51 of the Land Revenue Code necessarily requires notices to be issued to the petitioner.

In taking this view, I am supported by the order passed by the Division Bench of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh in the case of ***Biharilal v. State of Madhya Pradesh and others and connected matter, 2010 (2) MPHT 115 (DB)*** and another order of the Division Bench in the case of ***Shaheed Anwar Vs. Board of Revenue and another, 2000 RN 76***.

5. In view of above, impugned orders cannot be sustained in law and are set aside. The concerned authority however shall be at liberty to initiate fresh proceedings after affording proper opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.”

2. In view of above, the writ petition is allowed. Impugned order dated 15.05.2015 passed by Tahsildar, Dabhra and the order dated 20.04.2015 passed by the SDO whereby the permission to review was granted, are set aside. The competent authority shall be at liberty to proceed in accordance with law.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Ashu