CGHC010084942004 2026:CGHC:47047

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

FA No. 39 of 2004

1 - Siyaram Rawat S/o Punnuram Rawat Aged About 45 Years R/o Village-Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

--- **Appellant(s)**

versus

1 - Muliabai D/o Late Sukhru Rawat Aged About 44 Years (Wife Of Chintaram Yadav), R/o Biretara, Patwari Circle No. 41, Bhothali, Tah. And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

2. Baisakhinbai W/o Gopal Yadav Aged About 38 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

3. Sadhinbai W/o Punaram Yadav Aged About 34 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

4. Gopal S/o Jhurag Yadav Aged About 40 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

5. Punaram Yadav S/o Chaitram Rawat Aged About 36 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

6. Loknath Sahu S/o Vishram Sahu Aged About 40 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

7. Nand Kumar S/o Namalum Sahu Aged About 40 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

8. Milap S/o Pancham Dhimar Aged About 37 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

9. Milau S/o Pancham Dhimar Aged About 40 Years R/o Village- Birtara, Post- Doma, Tehsil And District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

10. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Collector, Dhamtari (C.G.)

--- **Respondent(s)**

(Cause-title taken from the Case Information System)

For Appellant :- None in two rounds.
For State :- Ms. K. Radhika, Panel Lawyer

SB - Hon'ble Smt. Justice Sushma Sawant

Judgment On Board

05.11.2026

1. This first appeal has been preferred against the impugned judgment and decree dated 03.01.2004 passed by learned Additional District Judge, Dhamtari, District – Dhamtari in Civil Suit No.14-A/2002.

2. It appears from the record that despite repeated opportunities, the appellant has remained absent on successive dates of hearing. Consequently, pursuant to the order dated 03.04.2025, SPC was issued to the appellant but despite service of notice, none has appeared on his

behalf on 06.05.2025 & 23.07.2025. It thus appears that the appellant is not interested in prosecuting the appeal.

3. Even today, the matter was called up twice for hearing but none appeared on behalf of the appellant, nor was any representation made on his/her behalf. In these circumstances, this Court is left with no option but to dismiss the instant appeal for want of prosecution.

4. Accordingly, the instant appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-
(Sushma Sawant)
Judge

@d!t!