CGHC010425522026 2026:CGHC:45973

RUCHI YADAV Digitally signed by RUCHI YADAV

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 5483 of 2026

1 - Ankit Agrawal S/o Raghuveer Agrawal, Aged About 41 Years R/o C-47, Sector-4, Devendra Nagar, Raipur Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Transport, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Regional Transport Officer/ Registration Officer/ Taxation Officer, Raipur, Distt Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title taken from CIS Periphery)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. B.L. Dembra, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Mr. Akhilesh Kumar, G.A., appears on advance copy

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

30/10/2026

1. By way of this petition, the petitioner has prayed for following reliefs:-

> "10.1 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ or direction, calling for the records from the concerned authorities for its kind perusal.

10.2 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ or direction, quashing/set-aside the order dated 25.07.2025 passed by the respondent no. 02 and further proceedings initiated against the petitioner by the respondent no. 02 may be quashed.

10.3. That, the Hon'ble Court may further be pleased to direct the respondent no. 02 to decide the application of review dated 25.08.2025 within stipulated time as this Hon'ble Court deems fit.

10.4 Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper looking to the facts and circumstances of the case may also be awarded to the petitioner including the cost and expenses of this petition. An affidavit in support of this petition is filed herewith."

2. At the outset, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had submitted an application dated 25.08.2025 before respondent No. 2, seeking reconsideration of the tax liability imposed upon him. It is submitted that the vehicle in question was not being operated during the relevant period and its fitness certificate had also expired. Learned counsel submits that the limited relief sought by the petitioner is for a direction to the concerned authority to consider and decide the aforesaid application in accordance with law.

3. Learned State counsel, appearing for the respondents, submits that since the petitioner is seeking only a direction for consideration and decision on the pending application, he has no objection to the same.

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

5. Considering the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner and the fact that the application dated 25.08.2025 is stated to be pending consideration before the concerned authority, respondent No. 2 is directed to consider and decide the petitioner's application, in accordance with law by passing a reasoned and speaking order, preferably within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim raised by the petitioner and the concerned authority shall consider the application independently, in accordance with law.

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

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Ruchi