



2026:CGHC:4145



2026:CGHC:4145

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### WPC No. 323 of 2026

**1** - N. Santoshi W/o Shri N. Ramarao Aged About 32 Years R/o Ward No. 25 Jagriti Chowk Santoshi Para, Camp 2, Tehsil And Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh. (Wrongly Mentioned As N. Santosh In The Impugned Stay Order)

... **Petitioner**

**versus**

**1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Revenue Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**2** - The Collector Durg, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

**3** - The Additional Tehsildar Bhilai Nagar, Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

**4** - Smt. Manju Devi Agrawal W/o Ramavtar Agrawal Aged About 56 Years R/o Nehru Nagar, Bhilai, Tehsil And Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh.

**5** - Smt. N. Shailja W/o Shri N. Dhanraju Aged About 35 Years R/o Ward No. 25 Jagriti Chowk Santoshi Para, Camp 2, Tehsil And Distt. Durg, Chhattisgarh. (Wrongly Mentioned As Dhanraju In The Impugned Stay Order Ann. P/1) (Wrongly Mentioned As L. Shailja In The Impugned Order )

... **Respondents**

**(Cause tittle, as taken from Case Information System)**

---

For Petitioner : Mr. Vidya Bhushan Soni, Advocate.

---

For Respondent : Mr. Anadi Sharma, Panel Lawyer.

---



**{Hon'ble Mr. Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi}**

**Order on Board**

**23/01/2026**

**1.** Instant writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been preferred by the petitioner seeking following reliefs :-

“10.1 In view of the above facts and grounds this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash / set-aside the stay order dated 03/12/2025 issued by the Add. Tahsildar, Bhilai Nagar, District Durg, Chhattisgarh (Annexure P-1)

10.2 That any other relief which this Hon'le Court deems fit and proper may also be granted in favour of the petitioners safeguarding his interest.”

**2.** Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is registered owner of the land bearing Khasra No. 1606/109, area 3200 sq.ft. situated at village Kurud, Patwari Halka No. 46, Tahsil & District Durg (C.G.). He further submits that Additional Tahsildar, Bhilai Nagar, District Durg had issued notice dated 03.12.2025 (AnnexureP-1) to the petitioner and respondent No. 5. Contents of the said notice reveal that Smt. Manju Devi Agarwal has made an application claiming herself to be the owner of the land bearing Khasra No. 1607/99, area 6400 sq. ft. and it is alleged that the petitioner and respondent No. 5 are raising construction on the portion of the aforesaid land, therefore, report has been sought for from the concerned Revenue Inspector & Patwari in this regard and till then stay order has been issued on the above construction work. It is next contended that aforesaid notice does not pertain to the land of the petitioner bearing Khasra No. 1606/109, area 3200 sq.ft., despite that, said notice has been served to him. Hence, he prays that effect & operation of the impugned notice dated 3.12.2025 may be stayed.

**3.** Per contra, learned counsel for the State submits there seems to be demarcation dispute, which can be resolved by the Additional Tahsildar in



revenue case. He further submits that while passing the impugned notice dated 03.12.2025 (Annexure P-1), the petitioner has been directed to file reply to the application filed by Smt. Manju Devi Agrawal, therefore, no case of writ petition to be entertained by this Court is made out.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

5. Perusal of impugned notice dated 03.12.2025 (Annexure P-1) show that the said revenue case was fixed for hearing before Additional Tahsildar, Bhilainagar, District Durg on 12.12.2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner further informed that on the aforesaid date i.e. 12.12.2025, the petitioner entered her appearance, but on that date Tahsildar was not present there. Moreover, a perusal of the contents of the notice also reveals that there appears to be a case of encroachment, which can be decided by the Additional Tehsildar in the revenue case. Therefore, the petitioner is at liberty to file reply to the impugned notice dated 03.12.2025 and may also raise objection regarding the status of his land Khasra No. 1606/109, area 3200 sq. ft. and if it is found that land of the petitioner is not adjacent to the land of Smt. Manju Devi Agrawal, then appropriate order be passed by the Additional Tahsildar. In that view of the matter, I am not inclined to entertain instant writ petition, hence, the same is liable to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-  
(Naresh Kumar Chadravanshi)  
Judge