



2026:CGHC:4097

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

FA No. 127 of 2020

Rambai Gupta W/o Late Kanhaiya Prasad Gupta Aged About 75 Years R/o Santoshi Mandir, Near Math Talab, Kailashpuri, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

Appellant

versus

- 1 - Tulendra Sahu S/o Late Abhay Ram Sahu Aged About 51 Years R/o Parthvi Nagar, Heerapur Road, Mahoba Bazar, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh**
- 2 - Purushottam Gupta S/o Ram Prasad Gupta R/o Santoshi Mandir, Near Math Talab, Kailashpuri, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.**
- 3 - Siya Ram Gupta S/o Ram Prasad Gupta R/o Santoshi Mandir, Near Math Talab, Kailashpuri, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh**
- 4 - Sanjay Gupta S/o Kanhaiya Gupta Aged About 57 Years R/o Santoshi Mandir, Near Math Talab, Kailashpuri, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.**
- 5 - Smt. Savitri Gupta W/o Sanjay Gupta R/o Santoshi Mandir, Near Math Talab, Kailashpuri, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.**
- 6 - Vishwanath Yadav R/o Shri Ram Chowk, Tikra Para, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.**
- 7 - Pawan Yadav S/o Vishwanath Yadav R/o Shri Ram Chowk, Tikra Para, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.**

8 - Gagan Yadav S/o Vishwanath Yadav Aged About 19 Years R/o Shri Ram Chowk, Tikra Para, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

9 - Pinki Yadav D/o Vishwanath Yadav Aged About 18 Years R/o Shri Ram Chowk, Tikra Para, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

10 - Shani Yadav S/o Vishwanath Yadav Aged About 26 Years R/o Near Nootan School, Purani Basti, R. D. A. Chhota Colony, Tikra Para, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh

11 - Dhaneshwar Nath Chandrakar S/o Kedarnath Chandrakar R/o Subhash Nagar, Kukri Talab, Math Para, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant(s) : None

For Respondent(s) : None

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

23.01.2026

1. On the last date of hearing, a SPC was issued to the appellant as the counsel appearing for the appellant on the earlier occasion had submitted that the appellant was not in contact with them.
2. As per the office report, the sole appellant has expired.
3. Since no one is appearing on behalf of the appellant and no application has been filed for bringing the legal representatives of the sole appellant on record, this Court deems it appropriate to dismiss the case for want of prosecution.
4. Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-

**(Bibhu Datta Guru)
Judge**