



2026:CGHC:16768-DB



2026:CGHC:16768-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WA No. 298 of 2026**

Gopal Prasad Bind S/o Late Sobhnath Bind Aged About 59 Years R/o
Akash Nagar, Near Patwari Prashikashan Kendra, P.S. Sarkanda
District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Appellant(s)**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, General Administrative Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. High Power Caste Scrutiny Committee Through President-Cum-Secretary Department Of Schedule Caste And Schedule Tribe Development, Tribal Research Training Institute, Pt. Dindayal Upadhyay Nagar, Sector-4, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Registrar Cooperative Society Raipur Indravati Bhawan, New Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh

...Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant	:	Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Praveen Das, Additional Advocate General.



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

13.04.2025

1. Heard Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, learned counsel for the appellant. Also heard Mr. Praveen Das, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the State.

2. The present intra-Court appeal has been preferred by the appellant against the order dated 13.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPC No. 1159 of 2016 (*Gopal Prasad Bind vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*), whereby the application for amendment in the writ petition has been dismissed.

3. At the outset, learned State counsel has raised a preliminary objection as to the maintainability of the present appeal, contending that the impugned order is purely interlocutory in nature and, therefore, expressly barred from appeal in view of Section 2(1) of the Chhattisgarh High Court (Appeal to Division Bench) Act, 2006 (for short, "Act of 2006").

4. Section 2(1) of the Act of 2006 reads as follows:

"2. Appeal to the Division Bench of the High Court from a Judgment or order of one judge of the High Court made in exercise of original jurisdiction. -

(1) An appeal shall lie from a judgment or order



passed by one judge of the High Court in exercise of original Jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to a Division Bench comprising of two Judges of the same High Court.

Provided that no such appeal shall lie against an interlocutory order or against an order passed in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.”

5. A plain reading of the aforesaid provision makes it evident that no appeal shall lie before a Division Bench against an interlocutory order. The order impugned herein, rejecting the application for amendment, is interlocutory in nature.

6. In view of the above, the present appeal is not maintainable and is, accordingly, **dismissed**. However, considering that the writ petition is of the year 2016, we deem it appropriate to request the learned Single Judge to make an endeavour to decide the writ petition expeditiously, in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice