

11.10.2023
Sl. No.15(DL)
srm

C.O. No. 3231 of 2023

Subrata Ari & Anr.

Versus

Tapan Kumar Ari & Ors.

Mr. Kapil Chandra Sahoo

...for the Petitioners.

The learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that a construction was sought to be raised under the PMAY(G) scheme and a prayer before the learned court seeking permission to raise the construction from the funds received under the PMAY(G) was made, by filing an application. Such application was rejected. From the application filed before the learned court below, it does not appear that the petitioners had been listed as beneficiaries under the said housing scheme and the money in the form of instalments had been sent to any of the bank accounts of the petitioners.

Under such circumstances, this Court does not find any illegality in the order impugned. The learned court below has specifically held that without a local inspection it would not be possible to understand the exact nature and the extent of construction which the petitioners wanted to complete. Rather, it appears that the petitioners wanted to complete a

construction which was ongoing and could not do so because of the order of *status quo*.

The revisional application is dismissed.

If in future, the petitioners are listed as beneficiaries under any housing scheme, the petitioners can move the learned court below for necessary orders upon proof of such contentions.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Parties are directed to act on the basis of the server copy of this order.

(Shampa Sarkar, J.)