



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SA No. 577 of 2016

Chandarmati Died Through legal Representative **versus** Chandrika

Order on Board

25/09/2025	Mr. Vivek Kumar Tripathi, counsel for appellant. Mr. Aman Tamboli, P.L. for State-respondent/State. Heard. This second appeal is admitted on following substantial questions of law :- 1. Whether the learned Courts below justified in allowing the suit for possession of property recorded in name of Malikram, father of original defendant No.1 (maternal grand father of appellant) only considering the no objection given by defendant No.2 (second wife of Malikram), who according to Hindu law was not having any right to succeed in ancestral property received in share of Malikram? 2. Whether the learned Courts below justified in passing the judgment and decree taking
--------------------------	---

note of an order of partition dated 04.08.2010 passed by Tahsildar of land situated at Sonadih only without considering the other ancestral property situated at Village Budgahan (another village where two other brothers of Malikram were residing) and they were in possession of property situated at village Budgahan?

Issue notice to respondents.

Learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.10, hence, process fee is not required to be paid for issuance of notice to respondent No.10.

On payment of process fee, issue notice to respondent No.1 to 9 as per rules making it returnable within four weeks.

List this case after four weeks.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge