



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 757 of 2013

Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited

versus

The Collector Office Of The Collector And Ors.

Order Sheet

21/11/2025	Ms. Sharmila Singhai, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Hrishabh Deo Shukla learned Advocate for the petitioner. Mr. Rajkumar Gupta, learned Additional Advocate General, for the State. Mr. Ayaz Naved and Mr. Harshmandar Rastogi, learned Advocates for the respective respondent(s). This Court on 13.11.2024 has passed the following orders:- “Learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner/bank submits that the land bearing Khasra No. 445/1 total area measuring 21.7-5, i.e. 16.70 acres was decreed in favour of the

	petitioner/bank by the Debt Recovery Tribunal, which remained unchallenged and it was binding upon the parties. Out of that land, land of 10 acres has been allotted by the Additional Collector, Raipur to respondents No. 2 & 3, namely Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited and Chhattisgarh State Power Transmission, Company Limited, respectively by the impugned order, which is challenged. However, during pendency of the instant petition, a Power Sub station has been constructed on the said land and from the said power sub station power distribution is continued. The major recipient of power is AIMS, Raipur. It seems that the land In question cannot be returned back and as such learned Senior counsel for the petitioner/bank prays that instead of the said land the State can arrange alternative land in lieu of the land which has been illegally taken over by them. Learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents, upon the above submission, when questioned, submitted that they have to seek instructions upon this proposal because admittedly the sub station has been constructed over the said land and even if the petition is allowed the said land cannot be handed over to the petitioner/bank. Accordingly, the State/respondents is directed to get proper instructions on the next date of hearing and if they would fail to receive proper instructions by that date, the petitioner will be heard without
--	---

AMITA DUBEY Digitally signed by AMITA DUBEY Date: 2025.11.24 11:53:05 +0530 Ami	there being any instructions.” This Court on 07.11.2025 granted 10 days’ time to learned State Counsel to comply with the order dated 13.11.2021, failing which respondent No. 1 was directed to appear before this Court. In compliance of the said order, Mr. Gaurav Kumar Singh/respondent No. 1 appeared through video conferencing and submits that the petitioners were shown different lands in lieu of the secured assets, however, the settlement could not be materialised. Let this case be listed on 12th of December, 2025 enabling the learned State counsel to place on records the details of the land which has been shown to the petitioner, its valuation and minutes of the meeting convened between the petitioner and the respondents if recorded. The respondent is also directed to place on record the valuation of property of the lease-deed Ex. P/2. Sd/- (Sachin Singh Rajput) Judge
--	---