CGHC010419492026

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WP227 No. 1389 of 2026

Suresh Kumar Jagatramka (In Person) S/o Late Shri Banwari Lal Jagatramka Aged About 69 Years R/o Gandhi Chowk, Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - Mahesh Kumar Jagatramka S/o Late Shri Banwari Lal Jagatramka Aged About 73 Years R/o - Kolkata At Present R/o Station Road, Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh

2 - Smt. Pushpa Saraf W/o Prem Kumar Saraf Aged About 70 Years R/o - 3/a Siddheswari Road Kolkata - 29 At Present R/o Station Chowk, Raigarh. Tahsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

3 - Pradip Kejdiwal S/o Late Manohar Lal Kejriwal Aged About 57 Years R/o 19- B James Long Sarani Kolkata- 38, At Present Subhash Chowk Raigarh, Tehsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

4 - Spectram Infonent Pvt. Ltd. Director Bharat Agrawal S/o Vijay Agrawal, Aged About 42 Years R/o Chakradhar Nagar, Raigarh, Tehsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

5 - Indrapal Singh Bhatiya S/o Hervansh Singh Bhatiya Business- Vyapar R/o Jagatpur Raigarh, Tehsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

6 - Sunil Agrawal S/o Ramdas Agrawal Business - Vyapar R/o Friends Colony Raigarh Tehsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

7 - Poonamchand Agrawal S/o Late Lalchand Agrawal Business - Vyapar, R/o Gandhi Ganj, Raigarh Tehsil And District Raigarh (C.G.)

8 - State Of Chhattisgarh By The District Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title is taken from the CIS)

For Petitioner	:	Shri Suresh Kumar Jagatramka , petitioner in person
For Respondent/State	:	Ms Isha Jajodiya, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal

Order on Board

05.11.2026

1. Present is a Writ Petition filed by the petitioner against the impugned order dated 29.09.2026 passed by the learned Third Additional District Judge, Raigarh in Civil Suit-A/8/2021, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Order 7 Rule 14 r/w Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) was partly allowed and only the photographs and the order dated 08.10.2025 passed by this Court in WP-279 of 2021 have been taken on record and with respect to other documents, the application has been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that petitioner is a plaintiff before the learned trial Court, who is prosecuting a suit for declaration of title, cancellation of sale deeds and permanent injunction with respect to the subject property. During pendency of the suit, certain developments have been surfaced in the revenue proceeding before the Nazul Officer, Raigarh with respect to renewal of the patta of the subject property, the revenue orders passed by the revenue authorities and the Rent Controlling Authority (RCA). The petitioner filed certified copies of those documents of the orders of revenue authorities which are related to the subject land and the defendants. Yet the learned trial Court partly rejected the application filed by the petitioner by holding that the other documents are not relevant with the facts and issue involved in the case. He would further submit that during pendency of the suit, plaintiff has informed the Nazul Officer regarding pendency of the Civil Suit and initiation of proceeding by the RCA and orders passed by this Court in WP227 No.279 of 2021 on 08.10.2025. The document relating to revenue proceeding pending before the Nazul Officer, Raigarh and the RCA are very relevant in the facts and circumstances of the present case for effective adjudication between

the parties. The plaintiff evidence has not been started yet. The defendants have their right to cross-examine the plaintiff witnesses on documents so filed by him and therefore, no prejudice has been caused to any of the parties. Therefore, the entire documents which have been filed by the plaintiff along with his application should be allowed instead of partly rejecting it. Therefore, the impugned order may be set aside and the application may be allowed by directing the documents to be taken on record.

3. I have heard the petitioner in person and perused the documents annexed with the petition.

4. In the application filed by the petitioner under order 7 Rule 14 r/w Section 151 of the CPC (Annexure P2) it transpires that the petitioner has averred in his application that the documents are related to revenue proceeding and the proceeding pending before the RCA with respect to subject property and those orders and the documents are very relevant in the facts and the issue involved in the present case. Copies of the documents have also been annexed in the present writ petition, which is sought to be produced by the plaintiff before the learned trial court and from perusal of those documents, it transpires that the plaintiff sought the documents to be produced before the learned trial Court is the report dated 20.01.2026 given by the Revenue Inspector, Nazul Raigarh and the order-sheets of the learned Nazul Officer dated 13.04.2026. Further, the notice issued by the RCA, Raigarh on an application filed by the defendants. All these documents are related to the subject property situated at street-44, Plot-3/1, Area-4,800 SFT situated at village-Raigarh. In those documents, defendant-4/respondent-4 Spectram Infonent Private Limited,

made an application for renewal of Nazul lease granted with respect to the subject property and the order passed by the Nazul Officer, Raigarh.

5. Present is a case where the documents submitted by the plaintiff before the learned trial Court in the suit has been rejected. The relevancy of the documents is to be considered during the trial, when the plaintiff sought them exhibited in evidence and objection, if any, raised by the defendants regarding its admissibility, or evidentiary value. The defendants have every right to cross-examine the plaintiff on the documents so filed by him in the suit. However, at this stage, it cannot be said that the documents are not relevant and they cannot be taken on record.

6. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered opinion that the documents filed by the plaintiff can be taken on record, subject to their admissibility and evidentiary value, which are to be decided along with other issues by the learned trial Court.

7. As a result, the impugned order passed by the learned trial Court is set aside and the application filed by the plaintiff under Order 7, Rule 14 r/w Section 151 of the CPC is **allowed** and the entire documents filed along with the said application are directed to be taken on record subject to their admissibility and evidentiary value. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed in the case in accordance with law.

8. Present writ petition is allowed to the extent indicated herein above.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
JUDGE

padma