



2025:CGHC:21865

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1907 of 2024

1 - Rakesh Vidhani S/o Late Shri Manohar Vidhani Aged About 41
Years R/o Plot No. 5, Railway Area, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway
Manager (D R M), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway,
Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central
Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal
Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

5 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management,
State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur,
Chhattisgarh.

6 - Collector Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur

Chhattisgarh.

7 - Joint Collector - Cum - Officer - In - Charge Land Allotment Branch,
Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1967 of 2024

1 - Ramchand Son Of Shri Tahal Ram Aged About 63 Years Plot No.
17, Tilda, Dist. Raipur, C.G.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway
Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, C.G.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway,
Raipur Division, Raipur, C.G.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central
Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, C.G.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal
Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated
25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management,
State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur,
Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur,
Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1966 of 2024

1 - Vadhupal Kotwani S/o Shri Narupal Kotwani, Aged About 52 Years Plot No. 7, Tilda, District-Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1968 of 2024

1 - Rajkumar Lakhwani S/o Shri Ishwar Das Lakhwani Aged About 39 Years Plot No.4, Tilda District- Raipur Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Senior Divisional Enginner, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1970 of 2024

1 - Kanhaiya Lal Thawrani S/o Shri Lila Ram Thawrani Aged About 58 Years Plot No.13, Tilda District- Raipur Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Senior Divisional Enginner, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector Raipur, Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1971 of 2024

1 - Harish Khubchandani, S/o Shri Hemraj Khubchandani Aged About 54 Years Plot No. 9, Tilda, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1974 of 2024

1 - Omprakash Premchandani @ Prakash Chand S/o Shri Shri Ladukmal Premchandani Aged About 58 Years Plot No. 6, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara South East Central Railway, Raipur Division Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1975 of 2024

1 - Hiranand Madhwani S/o Shri Sewak Ram Madhwani, Aged About 39 Years Plot No.20, Railway Area, Tilda, District Raipur (C.G.)

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, (Cg)

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh

6 - Collector, Raipur, Collectorate Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Office-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1977 of 2024

1 - Mohan Das S/o Shri Harnam Das Aged About 53 Years Plot No. 16,
Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway
Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur South East Central Railway,
Raipur Division, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara South East Central
Railway, Raipur Division Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal
Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

5 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management,
State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur,
Chhattisgarh.

6 - Collector Raipur, Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur
Chhattisgarh.

7 - Joint Collector - Cum - Officer - In - Charge Land Allotment Branch,
Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1978 of 2024

1 - Rajkumar Bhagwani S/o Shri Ishwar Das Bhagwani Aged About 39 Years R/o Plot No. 2 And 3, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway Manager (D R M), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1995 of 2024

1 - Shiv Kumar Nihichlani S/o Shri Pritam Das Nihichlani, Aged About 50 Years R/o Plot No. 188, Tilda, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1992 of 2024

1 - Omprakash Fatnani S/o Shri Chetan Das Fatnani Aged About 62 Years Plot No. 14, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway Manager (D R M), D R M Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector - Cum - Officer-In-Charge Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated- 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1991 of 2024

1 - Deepak Nihichalani S/o Shri Chandrasen Nihichalani, Aged About 26 Years Plot No.1, Railway Area, Tilda, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1990 of 2024

1 - Indra Kumar Meghani @ Indrapal S/o Shri Jeumal Meghani, Aged About 77 Years Plot No. 8, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

5 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

6 - Collector Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

7 - Joint Collector - Cum - Officer - In - Charge Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1981 of 2024

1 - Jitendra Madhwani S/o Shri Sewak Ram Madhwani, Aged About 39 Years Plot No. 19, Railway Area, Tilda, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1984 of 2024

1 - Hira Nand Lalwani S/o Shri Ayaldas, Aged About 57 Years Plot No. 155, Tilda, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1938 of 2024

1 - Vasudev Thawrani S/o Shri Changulmal Thawrani, Aged About 69 Years Plot No. 122, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer, Raipur South East Central Railway, Raipur Divisional Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works), Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

5 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

6 - Collector Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

7 - Joint Collector - Cum - Officer - In - Charge Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1883 of 2024

1 - Kishan Chand Khubchandani S/o Shri Chandumal Khubchandani Aged About 67 Years R/o Plot No. 10, Tilda, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway, Through The Divisional Railway Manager (D R M), Drm Office, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Chief Secretary State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh

5 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh

6 - Collector Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

7 - Joint Director-Cum-Officer-In-Charge Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 2000 of 2024

1 - Puran Lal Bhagwani @ Vijay Kumar Puran Son Of Shri Ishwar Das Bhagwani Aged About 74 Years Plot No. 3, Tilda, Dist. Raipur, C.G.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, C.G.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, C.G.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, C.G.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

--- Respondent(s)

WPC No. 1979 of 2024

1 - Teekam Das Nihichlani Son Of Shri Pritam Das Nihichlani Aged About 56 Years Plot No. 11, Tilda, Dist. Raipur, C.G.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - South East Central Railway Through The Divisional Railway Manager (Drm), Drm Office, Raipur, C.G.

2 - Senior Divisional Engineer Raipur, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Raipur, C.G.

3 - Senior Section Engineer (Works) Bhatapara, South East Central Railway, Raipur Division, Bhatapara, C.G.

4 - Chief Secretary, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

5 - Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

6 - Collector, Raipur Collectorate Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

7 - Joint Collector-Cum-Officer-In-Charge, Land Allotment Branch, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 25-02-2025)

... Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from the Case Information System)

For Petitioners :- Mr. Amrito Das, Advocate

For State :- Mr. R.K. Gupta, Addl. A.G. & Mr. Praveen Das,
Dy. A.G.

For Respondent- Railways :- Mr. Ramakant Mishra, DSG
along with Mr. Tushar Dhar Diwan, Advocate

SB- Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order On Board

09.05.2025

1. Heard Mr. Amrito Das, Counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. R.K. Gupta, Addl. A.G., Mr. Praveen Das, Dy. A.G., for the State as well as Mr. Ramakant Mishra, DSG along with Mr. Tushar Dhar Diwan, Counsel for the respondent-Railways.
2. In these bunch of cases, the petitioners in each petition have raised a common grievance and are aggrieved by the alleged illegal and arbitrary acts of the respondent-Railways, which involve the removal of shops of the allottees for the purpose of constructing and remodeling the Raipur Railway Station. Earlier licenses were granted to individuals, and after the efflux of time, the original allottees passed away, and the shops allotted to them are now being operated by their legal heirs or successors. All the petitioners are aggrieved by the common order of eviction passed on 12.01.2023, under which the petitioners occupying respective land and shops at Tilda Railway premises of Raipur Railway Division have been directed to vacate the same. The notice informed that under the **Amrit Bharat Station Yojana**, the Tilda Railway Station is being redeveloped, and for this purpose, the shops allotted to the shopkeepers are required to be removed. Consequently, the concerned petitioners/shopkeepers were directed to remove their articles from the shops from the Railway premises to facilitate the completion of the redevelopment work within stipulated time. Since all the petitioners were granted shops by the Railways and have received the aforementioned notice dated 12.01.2023, they have

filed separate petitions while raising a common grievance. Therefore, these petitions are being clubbed together, heard together, and decided together by this common order.

3. The reliefs prayed for by the petitioners in all the writ petitions are same and one with certain variations, however, in order to adjudicate these petitions, WPC No. 1907/2024 (Rakesh Vidhani vs. South East Central Railways and Others) has been taken as lead petition for deciding the issues involved in these cases. The reliefs sought in the said petition are quoted hereinbelow:-

“10.1 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire record concerning the case of the petitioner from the railway authorities for its kind perusal and consideration.

10.2 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ quashing and setting the orders dated 12.01.2023 (ANNEXURE P-1) and 01.03.2024 (ANNEXURE P-2).

10.3 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issued appropriate writ directing the railways not to forcibly evict the petitioner without ensuring due compliance of the provisions of law.

10.4 Any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court, may deem fit and proper, in the facts and circumstances of the case.

10.5 That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents together to suitably rehabilitated the petitioner before the petitioner is displaced from the present shop.”

4. The grievance of the petitioners in the present bunch of writ petitions are the petitioners have been continuing his family's long-standing licensed occupation of a shop at the Tilda Railway Market, originally allotted to his uncle by the Railways in 1977. The market, developed post-independence for the rehabilitation of displaced Sindhi families and to support railway operations, has been a crucial commercial hub in Tilda, developed solely by the licensees with their own resources. Over decades, the Railways have consistently accepted license fees, sanctioned construction and renovations, and issued multiple circulars allowing for renewal of licenses, including transfer to legal heirs. Despite this, without notice or following due process, the Railways issued eviction orders dated 12.01.2024 and 01.03.2024, threatening forceful removal of the petitioner and others, disregarding their legal rights, livelihood, and the long-standing policy of resettlement and license renewal. Efforts for negotiation and relocation have been arbitrarily denied, while precedent at Bilaspur shows successful rehabilitation of licensees. The petitioner asserts that the eviction is illegal, unconstitutional, and contrary to the principles of natural justice, urging quashing of the impugned orders and proper resettlement in accordance with established policies and constitutional mandates.
5. Facts of the case are that the petitioners, who are residents and shopkeepers of Tilda Railway Market, have been conducting their

business legally and peacefully since 1953. Originally, this land was under the control of the District Council during the time of the British Raj, and subsequently the State Government, which issued licenses to the shopkeepers. Over time, the Indian Railways acquired this land. Recognizing the existence and rights of the existing shopkeepers, the Railways issued new licenses from 1973 onwards to regularize the situation. These licenses were routinely renewed, and the shopkeepers continued paying rent as fixed by the Railways. In 2007, the licenses of the petitioners were abruptly not renewed. No written explanation or show-cause notice was issued. Despite that, the Railways continued to accept rent, and the shopkeepers continued their businesses in good faith. Suddenly, in 2023–24, the Railways issued eviction notices to the petitioners, alleging that they are in unauthorized occupation. This action by the Railways is arbitrary, illegal, and against the principles of natural justice. The petitioners have not been given any opportunity to be heard or to explain their position. Many of the petitioners and their families have no other source of livelihood, and their eviction would amount to a violation of their fundamental rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The action also violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India, as similarly situated licensees in other Railway Markets across India have been granted renewals or rehabilitation under various schemes. Moreover, the petitioners,

having been in possession and paying rent for decades, are entitled to protection under the doctrine of legitimate expectation.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the impugned orders dated 12.01.2024 and 01.03.2024 are liable to be set aside as they have been passed in gross violation of the principles of natural justice. No notice or opportunity of hearing was provided to the petitioner prior to the issuance of the said orders, despite the fact that they entail serious civil consequences. The petitioners have been in lawful occupation of the premises pursuant to a license granted to his predecessor-in-interest and has been regularly paying the requisite license fee, which the respondent authorities have acknowledged to be valid until 31.03.2024. The Railway Board's own circulars recognize the rights of existing licensees and provide for renewal of licenses, particularly under the new 2022 policy, which contemplates grant of long-term licenses for a period of 35 years. Furthermore, even if the license period is deemed to have expired, the petitioner cannot be summarily evicted or treated as an encroacher. The law mandates that eviction in such circumstances must be undertaken strictly in accordance with the due process prescribed under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971. The actions of the respondent authorities in threatening forcible eviction and bypassing the statutory procedure are arbitrary, high-handed, and liable to be quashed.

7. It is further submitted that the petitioners are not encroachers, even though they may be required to be removed by the Railways after following due process of law. Since plots were allotted to the predecessors of the petitioners or to the petitioners themselves, on which they have constructed superstructures over barren land, the petitioners are entitled to compensation for the removal of these superstructures, after due assessment, as categorically stated in Clause 7 of the license agreement. The petitioners were granted shops on license and have continued to remain in possession for a long period, still operating their businesses. Therefore, the Railways are obligated to rehabilitate the petitioners before proceeding with any eviction. There is no doubt that the Railways have the right to develop the station and its adjoining areas; however, such development or beautification cannot come at the cost of the livelihood of poor families. The Railways may remove the petitioners from their respective premises only after ensuring proper rehabilitation, which is their responsibility. The occupiers of land or houses under such circumstances cannot be treated as encroachers. The current manner in which the petitioners are being removed from their shops is not only arbitrary but also illegal. The Railways cannot evict the petitioners by using muscle power, even if removal is required. Any such action must be conducted under the provisions of the **Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971**, which mandates a due legal procedure

before eviction. The Constitution guarantees certain fundamental rights to the petitioners, including the right to livelihood, and these must be upheld in all proceedings concerning their removal.

8. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent Railways vehemently opposes the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners and submits that although the petitioners had earlier entered into agreements with the respondents and were granted portions of land, the said land is now required for the development of the railway station. He argues that the development work is essential in light of the increasing population and rising pressure on the station, for which a plan has been sanctioned under the Amrit Bharat Station Scheme and funds have been accordingly allocated. He further states that earlier steps were taken to identify alternate locations for shops corresponding to those currently situated at the Tilda-Nevra Railway Station, and following a joint survey, a committee concluded that the matter of allotting alternate space could be reconsidered after the completion of the station development work, as construction is ongoing throughout the premises. He also submits that the licenses granted to the petitioners have already expired, and therefore, they no longer hold any legal right over the land or shops in question. Most of the petitioners were not granted leases or licenses in their own names, as the original allotments were made to their forefathers or fathers, and hence, no legal entitlement can be claimed by the present petitioners. In

light of the proposed modifications and beautification efforts under the Amrit Bharat Station Yojana, which include the development of the station and its surrounding areas, the eviction of the petitioners cannot be termed illegal or arbitrary. With regard to rehabilitation and resettlement, counsel for the Railways submits that after completion of the development and verification of available space within the premises, any suitable space, if available, may be allotted to the petitioners in accordance with due process of law. He clarifies that the petitioners do not possess any special rights but may participate in the allotment process as per the applicable rules and procedures.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their submissions put forth before me and have also gone through the documents appended to the writ petitions.

10. From a perusal of the pleadings of the petitioners and the arguments advanced by both parties, it is quite evident that the petitioners were originally allottees of shops and were granted licenses to operate them. However, with the efflux of time, those licenses, which were required to be renewed, have not been renewed, even though the petitioners have continued paying rent and other dues to the Railways. From the documents on record and the arguments made during the hearing, it is further clear that the Railways have proposed to redevelop and modify the railway station and its adjoining areas under the **Amrit Bharat Station Yojana**. Such development cannot be stalled merely because the

petitioners were previously granted leases for certain portions of land where they constructed their shops. These shops were allotted several decades ago, and in the intervening 30 to 40 years, the petitioners have constructed permanent structures and have been earning their livelihood from them. However, as the term of their licenses has already expired, the petitioners cannot, as a matter of right, demand rehabilitation or seek special consideration from the Railways.

11. This Court, by order dated 03.09.2024, noted the submission of the petitioners' counsel that there are several vacant plots where the petitioners could be relocated and allowed to construct new shops to continue their businesses. In response, counsel for the Railways submitted that instructions would be sought from the competent authority to determine whether such vacant land exists within the railway premises that could be allotted. Despite these submissions, no concrete proposal has been presented by the Railways regarding the allotment of alternative land to the petitioners. The respondents have repeatedly sought time to file their reply but have failed to do so.

12. This aspect of the matter has been considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Abdul Mateen Siddiqui vs. Union of India and Others** decided in **Civil Appeal No. 3518/2023** vide order dated 24.07.2024, wherein the Hon'ble Court has issued guidelines for making alternate arrangements of rehabilitation of encroachers who are residing within the railway

area. The relevant paragraphs of the said appeal are quoted hereinbelow:-

“3. It transpires during the course of hearing that approximately 30.040 hectares land, owned by the Railways/State, has been allegedly encroached upon. Further, 4365 houses are said to have been constructed at the site, where over 50,000 persons are living.

4. During the course of hearing, some video and still photographs have been referred to demonstrate the expeditious need of a part of the subject-land to shift the defunct railway line, besides development of the requisite infrastructure.

5. In view of the fact that hundreds of families are living at the site for decades, we have impressed upon the Union of India and the State of Uttarakhand to undertake the following exercise without any delay:

(i) In the first phase, to identify the strip of the land (the width and the length), which is required immediately for the purpose of shifting of the railway line or for construction of necessary infrastructure;

(ii) To identify the families, who are likely to be affected in the event of vacation from that land; and

(iii) The proposed site where such affected/uprooted families can be rehabilitated.

6. since the aforementioned point no. (iii) would require a policy decision at the Union/State level, we direct the Chief Secretary, State of

Uttarakhand to convene a meeting with the Railway Authorities, to be attended by Senior Officers from the Railway Ministry along with the Divisional Railway Manager of Railways, Uttarakhand and the Officers from Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, Government of India, so as to evolve a Rehabilitation Scheme subject to such terms and conditions which may be fair, just, equitable as well as acceptable to all the sides.

7. The first initiative shall be to identify the land, which is needed immediately (with full description of khasra number and the area of each khasra number). Similarly, the families, who are likely to be affected in the event of taking possession of that land be also identified without any delay.”

13. Further, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Krishna Ram Mahale vs. Mrs. Shobha Venkat Rao** reported in **(1989) 4 SCC 131** has held as under:-

“8. Mr. Tarkunde, learned Counsel for defendant No. 3, the appellant herein, rightly did not go into the appreciation of the evidence either by the Trial Court or the High Court or the factual conclusions drawn by them. It was, however, strongly urged by him that the period of licence had expired long back and the plaintiff was not entitled to the renewal of licence. It was submitted by him that in view of the licence having come to an end, the plaintiff had no right to remain in charge of the business or the premises where it was conducted and all that the

plaintiff could ask for was damages for unlawful dispossession even on the footing of facts as found by the High Court. We find ourselves totally unable to accept the submission of Mr. Tarkunde. It is a well-settled law in this country that where a person is in settled possession of property, even on the assumption that he had no right to remain on the property, he cannot be dispossessed by the owner of the property except by recourse to law. If any authority were needed for that proposition, we could refer to the decision of a Division Bench of this Court in [Lallu Yeshwant Singh v. Rao Jagdish Singh and Ors.](#) . this Court in that judgment cited with approval the well-known passage from the leading privy Council case of [Midnapur Zamindary Company Limited v. Naresh Narayan Roy](#) 51 I.A. 293 at p. 299. where it has been observed (p-208):

In India persons are not permitted to take forcible possession; they must obtain such possession as they are entitled to through a Court.

9. This proposition was also accepted by a Division Bench of this Court in [Rant Rattan and Ors. v. State of Uttar Pradesh](#) . The Division Bench comprising of three learned Judges held that a true owner has every right to dispossess or throw out a trespasser while he is in the act or process of trespassing but this right is not available to the true owner if the trespasser has been successful in accomplishing his possession to the knowledge of the true owner. In such circumstances, the law requires that the true

owner should dispossess the trespasser by taking recourse to the remedies under the law. In the present case, we may point out that there was no question of the plaintiff entering upon the premises as a trespasser at all, as she had entered into the possession of the restaurant business and the premises where it was conducted as a licensee and in due course of law. Thus, defendant No. 3 was not entitled to dispossess the plaintiff unlawfully and behind her back as has been done by him in the present case. It was pointed out by Mr. Tarkunde that some of the observations referred to above were in connection with a suit filed under [Section 6](#) of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 or analogous provisions in the earlier Specific Relief Act, 1877. To our mind, this makes no difference in this case as the suit has been filed only a few weeks of the plaintiff being unlawfully deprived of possession of the said business and the premises and much before the period of six months expired. In view of the aforesaid conclusions arrived at by us, we do not propose to consider the question whether the agreement between the plaintiff and defendant No. 3 amounted to a licence or a sub-lease.

10. Even apart from what we have observed above, we feel that in this case the conduct of defendant No. 3 is such that we should decline to entertain his appeal by special leave under [Article 136](#) of the Constitution. In the first place, he has unlawfully taken possession of the business and the premises thereof by collusion

and behind the back of the plaintiff. He made every attempt to retain this possession by every means, right or wrong. It is interesting to note that even after his appeal was dismissed by a Division Bench of the Bombay High Court, instead of complying with the decree or coming by way of a special leave immediately, in order to avoid compliance with the decree and to delay matters, he chose to file a suit, which can only be described as bogus, in the High Court being Suit No. 297 of 1974 for a declaration that the respondent herein (referred to by us 'the plaintiff') who was a defendant in that suit had no right, title or interest in the said premises or the business as from 1st May, 1965 and for a permanent injunction restraining her from executing the decree for possession obtained by her in the Bombay City Civil Court which was confirmed by the High Court. He took out a Notice of Motion for an interlocutory injunction in that suit which was dismissed by order dated 1 April 23, 1974. He led evidence which has been totally disbelieved by both the courts below. On a previous occasion when this appeal was taken up for hearing, learned Counsel for defendant No. 3, on instructions, made a statement that the plaintiff, who is the respondent before us, was dead. Without going into detail as to how that statement came to be made, we can only say that, in any event, instructions to make this statement seem to have been given recklessly and without any attempt to find out the truth thereof. The provisions of [Article 136](#) are not

intended to come to the assistance of such a party. In our opinion, this is certainly not an appeal in which any interference is called for under [Article 136](#) of the Constitution.

11. In the result, the appeal fails and is dismissed with costs throughout. The amount deposited by the appellant in this Court will be permitted to be withdrawn by the plaintiff who is respondent before us.

12. learned Counsel for the respondent submitted before us that the conduct of the appellant was such that apprehension could justly be entertained that the appellant would try to avoid compliance with the decree for possession confirmed by this Court by putting some outsider in possession or some other underhand means and that we should direct the executing court that the decree should be executed with the police help against any person or persons who might be in possession of the business and premises wherein it was conducted. Instead of giving any directions to the executing court in this regard, we order that the Court Receiver of Bombay High Court is appointed as the Receiver of the said business and the premises in which the same was conducted as stated aforeaid. He will take possession of the said business and premises from whosoever may be in possession thereof. He may apply for police help in taking possession if he thinks fit. The Receiver will then put the plaintiff in possession as his agent on usual terms without security on payments of

such outgoings as the Receiver may think fit but without asking for any royalty. This order will remain in force for a period of eight weeks from the date when the Receiver takes possession as aforesaid but will be subject to any orders which the executing court may pass after hearing the respondent herein.”

- 14.** Recently, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has made certain guidelines in respect of removal of superstructure in Re : Directions in the matter of demolition of structures reported in the 2024 SCC OnLine SC 3291 which reads as under:-

“DIRECTIONS

90. In order to allay the fears in the minds of the citizens with regard to arbitrary exercise of power by the officers/officials of the State, we find it necessary to Issue certain directions in exercise of our power under Article 142 of the Constitution. We are also of the view that even after orders of demolition are passed, the affected party needs to be given some time so as to challenge the order of demolition before an appropriate forum. We are further of the view that even in cases of persons who do not wish to contest the demolition order, sufficient time needs to be given to them to vacate and arrange their affairs. It is not a happy sight to see women, children and aged persons dragged to the streets overnight. Heavens would not fall on the authorities if they hold their hands for some period.

91. At the outset, we clarify that these directions will not be applicable if there is an unauthorized structure in any public place such as road, street, footpath, abutting railway line or any river body or water bodies and also to cases where there is an order for demolition made by a Court of law.

A. NOTICE

I. No demolition should be carried out without a prior show cause notice returnable either in accordance with the time provided by the local municipal laws or within 15 days' time from the date of service of such notice, whichever is later.

II. The notice shall be served upon the owner/occupier by a registered post A.D. Additionally, the notice shall also be affixed conspicuously on the outer portion of the structure in question.

III. The time of 15 days, stated herein above, shall start from the date of receipt of the said notice.

iv. To prevent any allegation of backdating, we direct that as soon as the show cause notice is duly served, intimation thereof shall be sent to the office of Collector/District Magistrate of the district digitally by email and an auto generated reply acknowledging receipt of the mail should also be issued from the office of the Collector/District Magistrate. The Collector/DM shall designate a nodal officer and also assign an email address and communicate the same to all the municipal and other authorities in charge of building regulations and demolition within one month from today.

v. The notice shall contain the details regarding:

- a. the nature of the unauthorized construction.*
- b. the details of the specific violation and the grounds of demolition.*
- c. a list of documents that the noticee is required to furnish along with his reply.*
- d. The notice should also specify the date on which the personal hearing is fixed and the designated authority before whom the hearing will take place;*
- vi. Every municipal/local authority shall assign a designated digital portal, within 3 months from today wherein details regarding service/pasting of the notice, the reply, the show cause notice and the order passed thereon would be available.*

B. PERSONAL HEARING

- I. The designated authority shall give an opportunity of personal hearing to the person concerned.*
- ii. The minutes of such a hearing shall also be recorded.*

C. FINAL ORDER

- I. Upon hearing, the designated authority shall pass a final order.*
- II. The final order shall contain:*
 - a. the contentions of the notice, and if the designated authority disagrees with the same, the reasons thereof;*
 - b. as to whether the unauthorized construction is compoundable, if it is not so, the reasons therefor;*
 - c. if the designated authority finds that only part of the construction is*

an unauthorized/noncompoundable, then the details thereof.

d. as to why the extreme step of demolition is the only option available and other options like compounding and demolishing only part of the property are not available.

D. AN OPPORTUNITY OF APPELLATE AND JUDICIAL SCRUTINY OF THE FINAL ORDER.

I. We further direct that if the statute provides for an appellate opportunity and time for filing the same, or even if it does not so, the order will not be implemented for a period of 15 days from the date of receipt thereof. The order shall also be displayed on the digital portal as stated above.

II. An opportunity should be given to the owner/occupier to remove the unauthorized construction or demolish the same within a period of 15 days. Only after the period of 15 days from the date of receipt of the notice has expired and the owner/occupier has not removed/demolished the unauthorized construction, and if the same is not stayed by any appellate authority or a court, the concerned authority shall take steps to demolish the same. It is only such construction which is found to be unauthorized and not compoundable shall be demolished.

iii. Before demolition, a detailed inspection report shall be prepared by the concerned authority signed by two Panchas.

E. PROCEEDINGS OF DEMOLITION

I. The proceedings of demolition shall be video-graphed, and the concerned authority shall prepare a demolition report giving the list of police

officials and civil personnel that participated in the demolition process. Video recording to be duly preserved.

ii. The said demolition report should be forwarded to the Municipal Commissioner by email and shall also be displayed on the digital portal.”

15. Now considering the case at hand in light of the aforesaid decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is held that while redevelopment, beautification, and modernization under the Amrit Bharat Station Yojana are indeed important, it is equally true that the livelihoods of long-standing occupants of railway premises should not be adversely affected in the name of development alone. In a democratic setup, the rehabilitation and resettlement of such shopkeepers must be undertaken in a fair and reasonable manner. The petitioners have been long-standing allottees and possessors of the shops in question, have constructed their shops over the allotted land, and have earned their livelihood without any reported complaints against them.

16. At this juncture, without commenting on the merits of the case, it would be appropriate to direct the petitioners to file individual, detailed representations along with all relevant documents in support of their reliefs. The concerned authorities are directed to consider the cases of each of the petitioners in a pragmatic and fair manner, particularly with regard to the allotment of shops in the newly developed and constructed

premises of Tilda-Newra Railway Station. The existing shops of the petitioners shall not be removed until and unless such removal is strictly necessary for the ongoing or future development work. At the same time, the petitioners are directed not to cause any obstruction or hindrance to the development activities being carried out by the Railways.

17. Accordingly, all the petitioners are directed to submit their individual, detailed representations before the competent Railway authority, and in turn, the railway authorities are directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders, while giving them proper opportunity of hearing and while considering the proposal made by the petitioners, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including the historical aspect that the shops were originally allotted to the forefathers of the petitioners as far back as the year 1984.

18. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

19. Accordingly, all the writ petitions stand **disposed of**.

sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge