CGHC010388732026 2026:CGHC:44186

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 5236 of 2026

1 - Priyash Agrawal S/o Narayan Agrawal Aged About 38 Years R/o Village Kudumkela, Tahsil Gharghoda, District Raigarh (C.G.)-496111

... Petitioner

versus

PRIYANKA VERMA
Digitally signed by PRIYANKA VERMA
Date: 2026.10.14 13:53:06 +0530

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capitol Complex, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Collector Raigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.)

3 - The Tahsildar Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

4 - Revenue Inspector Village Kudumkela, RNM - Gharghoda, Tahsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

5 - Patwari Village Kudumkela, Present Halka No. 02 (Formerly No 17), RNM - Gharghoda, Tahsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	**:**	Mr. Hari Agrawal, Advocate
For State	**:**	Mr. Priyank Rathi, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

13/10/2026

1. The petitioner, in this Writ Petition, has prayed for the following reliefs:-

> *“a. A writ and/or an order in the nature of appropriate writ directing the Respondent authorities particularly Respondent No. 1 to 2 to act appropriately and decide the representations of the Petitioner dated 01.11.2025 (Annexures P-6) by a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, within a time bound manner, as directed by this Hon'ble Court.*
> *b. Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in with the facts & circumstances of case.”*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent authorities have failed to decide the representations dated 01.11.2025 regarding alleged fraud and manipulation of land records by a revenue official. He further submits that the inaction of the authorities is arbitrary and contrary to law. Therefore, the present petition has been filed seeking appropriate directions to the respondent authorities.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner may approach the concerned authorities by filing an appropriate application.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. From the perusal of the averments made in the petition, this Court is of the view that the relief sought by the petitioner cannot be adjudicated in the present proceedings and, as such, the petitioner is at liberty to file an appropriate application before the concerned authorities, and in turn, the concerned authorities shall consider the same and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law.

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

7. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the present petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Priyanka