CGHC010128502012 2026:CGHC:43499

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SA No. 300 of 2012

1 - Mehettar S/o Sonuram Aged About 56 Years Caste Rawat Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

NIKITA JAIN

Digitally signed by NIKITA JAIN
Date: 2026.10.07 16:35:47 +0530

2 - Kholbahara S/o Sonuram Aged About 43 Years Caste Rawat Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

3 - Brijlal S/o Sonuram Aged About 49 Years Caste Rawat Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

4 - Bijelal S/o Sonuram Aged About 46 Years Caste Rawat Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

5 - Seejelal S/o Sonuram Aged About 44 Years Caste Rawat Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

6 - Chabilal S/o Sonuram Aged About 42 Years Caste Rawat Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

... Appellants

versus

1 - Jethu S/o Tijau Aged About 61 Years Caste Rawat (Dead), Legal Representatives,

1.1 - (A) Ramkumar S/o Jethu Aged About 41 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

1.2 - (B) Jageram S/o Jethu Aged About 38 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

1.3 - (C) Bhushan S/o Jethu Aged About 33 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

1.4 - (D) Jageshwari D/o Jethu Aged About 31 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

1.5 - (E) Bhuneshwari D/o Jethu Aged About 28 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

1.6 - (F) Pholbatia W/o Jethu Aged About 62 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

2 - Vishal (Dead) As Per Court Order Dt. 05-07-2021.

2.1 - Lacchan S/o Vishal Aged About 42 Years R/o Village Bhatgaon Tahsil And District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

2.2 - Radheshyam S/o Vishal Aged About 40 Years R/o Village Bhatgaon Tahsil And District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

2.3 - Ghanshyam S/o Vishal Aged About 38 Years R/o Village Bhatgaon Tahsil And District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

2.4 - Hero Bai Alias Rami Bai W/o Vishal, Aged About 65 Years R/o Village Bhatgaon Tahsil And District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

2.5 - Fagni D/o Vishal Aged About 25 Years R/o Darbe Kera Tahsil And

District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

3 - Kalabai W/o Vishal Aged About 86 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.,

4 - Peelibai D/o Bisroo Aged About 51 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.,

5 - Bhoonjibai @ Jhunjibai D/o Bisroo Aged About 48 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

6 - Bhori Bai D/o Bisroo Aged About 46 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

7 - Budharo S/o Sonsai Aged About 71 Years Caste Rawat R/o Village Bhatgaon, Revenue Block- Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

8 - Jagat S/o Kashi Aged About 51 Years Caste Rawat R/o Suarmal Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

9 - Bhagat S/o Kashi Aged About 45 Years Caste Rawat R/o Suarmal Komakhan, Tah. Bagbahara, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

10 - State Of Chhattisgarh S/o Thru- Collector, Mahasamund C.G.,

... Respondents

For Appellants	**:**	None.
For State/Respondent No.10	**:**	Shri Tarkeshwar Nande, Panel Lawyer.

Single Bench:Hon'ble Smt. Sushma Sawant, J

Order On Board

07.10.2026

1. This second appeal has been preferred against the impugned judgment

and decree dated 07.08.2012 passed by the Second Additional District Judge, Mahasamund (C.G.) in Civil Appeal No.24-A//2011.

2. Earlier the case was listed on 09.09.2024, however, none had appeared nor any representation is made on behalf of the appellants, therefore, the case was adjourned. Even today, when the case is called twice, none appears nor any representation is made on behalf of the appellants, therefore, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss this appeal for want of prosecution.

3. Accordingly, this second appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-
(Sushma Sawant)
JUDGE

Nikita