



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1369 of 2026

1 - Arjun Yadav S/o Shivnarayan Aged About 40 Years Caste Ahir, R/o Village Jori, Tahsil Lundra (Dhourpur), Distt. Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur, Distt. Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Collector District Surguja, Ambikapur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Tahsildar Lundra (Dhourpur), Distt. Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

Order Sheet

30/03/2026	Mr. Nishi Kant Sinha, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Sabyasachi Choubey, Govt. Advocate for the State/Respondents. Heard. Issue notice to the respondents. Learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of all the respondents, hence issuance of notice to them is dispensed with. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has constructed a house on encroached

government land admeasuring 0.018 hectares of Khasra No.73, Rakba 0.174 hectares, situated at Village Jori, Tahsil Lundra (Dhourpur), District Surguja (CG). He further submits that the petitioner has been in possession of the said land since the lifetime of his forefathers, i.e., for the last 40-50 years, by constructing a house and cultivating the land. Despite that, the impugned eviction warrant dated 11.03.2026 (Annexure P-1) has been issued against the petitioner, whereas the petitioner has already filed an application (Annexure P-2) for grant of patta in his favour before respondent No.2 / the Collector, Ambikapur, District Surguja (CG). Hence, learned counsel prays that the interim protection may be granted in favour of the petitioner.

In reply, learned counsel for the State/Respondents submits that an eviction order has been passed against the petitioner under Section 248 of the Chhattisgarh Land Revenue Code, 1959, by the Tahsildar, Lundra (Dhourpur), District Surguja/Respondent No.3 in Revenue Case No.202603020600031/A-68/2025-26 on 11.03.2026. Therefore, there is an efficacious alternative remedy available to the petitioner to file appeal against the said order. He further submits that demolition has already been carried out in pursuance of the eviction warrant (Annexure P-1) issued to the petitioner, and the same has already been executed. Learned State counsel also seeks time to file reply.

On this, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the eviction order has not been fully executed and that only one column has been demolished.

As prayed, two weeks' time is granted to learned State

Rukhsar	counsel to file a reply. Meanwhile, purely as an interim measure, it is directed that <i>status quo</i>, as it exists today in respect of the subject property, shall be maintained by both the parties till the next date of hearing. List the case after two weeks. CC as per rules. Sd/- (Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi) Judge
---------	--