

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**REVIEW PETITION NO. 135 OF 2021**

- Shri Rupanadham Steel Pvt. Ltd., a Company duly incorporated under the provision of Companies Act, having its Registered Office at 11 Shristi Garden, Telibandha, Raipur (C.G.), through its Authorised Signatory Shri Pawan Kumar Agrawal, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. National Highway Authority of India, through its Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, National Highway Zone, Pension Bada, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Sub Divisional Officer/Land Acquisition Officer, Manendragarh, District Korea (C.G.)
3. Smt. Bigni Bai, W/o Shivnath, R/o Village Nagpur, Tahsil Nagpur, District Korea (C.G.)
4. State of Chhattisgarh, through its Secretary, Department of Revenue, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.)
5. The Collector, District Korea (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ashish Surana, Advocate.
For Respondent 1	:	Ms. Poornima Singh, Advocate.
For Respondents 2, 4 & 5	:	Mr. Ayaz Naved, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****[06/10/2021]**

1. The present Review Petition has been filed by Petitioner on 5.10.2021 seeking for review of Order dated 11.2.2020 passed by this Court in W.P.(C) No.595/2020.
2. Thus, it is clear that the Review Petition has been filed after a period of more than 19 months from the date of disposal of W.P.(C) No.595/2020.
3. Another fact which reveals is that all the contentions which Petitioner has raised on the basis of which the review is being sought for were all well within the knowledge and notice of Petitioner at the time of contesting of the original Writ Petition itself. If the grounds that Petitioner is now raising were not raised or pleaded at the time of contesting of the Writ Petition, the Petitioner now by way of a Review Petition cannot be

permitted to get the matter reopened only on that ground. The remedy available to Petitioner was to challenge the findings given by this Court before the Appellate forum, which Petitioner does not seem to have availed. Moreover, this Court while disposing of the Writ Petition itself had reserved the right of Petitioner to avail other civil remedies available to them in respect of grievance so far as payment of compensation against the land which is said to be belonging to Petitioner, which stood acquired.

4. For all the aforesaid reasons, this Court is of the opinion that no strong case for entertaining the present Review Petition has been made out by Petitioner.

5. Review Petition thus being devoid of merits the same deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge