

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 920 of 2021**

- Lal Chandra Agrawal S/o Late Raghunath Prashad Agrawal Aged About 47 Years R/o Village- Silyari, P.S. Dharsiwa, Tehsil And Distt.- Raipur (Chhatisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Railways, Add.- Federation Of Railway Officers Association Office, 256-A, Rail Bhavan, Raisina Road, New Delhi- 110001
2. Divisional Railway Manager Office Raipur NH 200, Shrinagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh 492014
3. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Collector, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Sub-Divisional Officer (Revenue) Raipur, Distt.- Raipur (Chhatisgarh)
5. The Tahsildar (Revenue) Raipur, Dist. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Ms. Sharmila Singhai, Advocate

For Respondents No.1 & 2 : Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate

For Respondents/State : Ms. Sunita Jain, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****09/02/2021**

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the owner-in-occupation of a land bearing Khasra No.801/19 admeasuring 0.081 Hectares situated at Silyari. She would further submit that the respondents have proposed to install a pole inside the boundary of the house of the petitioner

without having acquired the same, therefore, the respondents may be restrained to demolish the house in question without following the due process of law.

3. Learned counsel for respondents No.1 & 2, on instructions, would submit that neither the demolition of house of the petitioner is proposed nor the pole is implanted inside the premises. He would further submit that if at all any acquisition is required to be made, it would be made by following the due process of law and no forceful demolition or ejectment would be carried out.
4. In view of such submission made by the respondents, no further adjudication by this Court would be required as the respondents have categorically stated that no forceful demolition or taking over the property is being carried out. So at this moment only on the basis of apprehension petition was filed and the apprehension has been negated by respondent.
5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Ashu