



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 238 of 2012

SANTOSH PUJARI *versus* STATE OF CHHATTISGARH & ANR

Alongwith

WPC No. 3571 of 2011, WPC No. 1637 of 2012 & WPC No. 692 of 2013

Order on Board

10.09.2025	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Advocate for the petitioners. Mr. Sanjeev Agrawal, Panel Lawyer for the State/ respondent No. 1. Mr. H.B. Agrawal, Senior Advocate with Ms. Preeti Yadav, Advocate for respondent No. 2. Heard on I.A. No. 8/2025 (in WPC No. 238/2012); I.A. No. 2/2025 (in WPC No. 3571/2011); I.A. No. 5/2025 (in WPC No. 1637/2012) and I.A. No. 5/2025 (in WPC No. 692/2013), applications for amendment in return on behalf of respondent No. 2. Learned Senior Counsel submits that by way of amendment, respondent No. 2 has described the procedure adopted by the authorities in ceiling proceeding. He contends that respondent No. 2 has placed certain

documents also along with applications to demonstrate its case.

On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners opposes.

Taking into consideration the fact that the petitioners have not proposed any new ground or fact, rather the procedure adopted by respondent No. 2 in ceiling proceeding has been elaborated by filing these applications, therefore, I.A. No. 8/2025 (in WPC No. 238/2012); I.A. No. 2/2025 (in WPC No. 3571/2011); I.A. No. 5/2025 (in WPC No. 1637/2012) and I.A. No. 5/2025 (in WPC No. 692/2013) stand allowed.

Respondent No. 2 is permitted to carry out the necessary amendment within period of seven working days.

Petitioners would be at liberty to move application(s) for any consequential amendment, if so advised.

Call these matters immediately thereafter.

Interim relief(s), if any, granted earlier shall continue till the next date of hearing.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge