



2026:CGHC:23541



2026:CGHC:23541

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 2749 of 2026

Gurmeet Singh Bedi S/o Late Shri K.S. Bedi Aged About 49 Years Prop. Blue Diamond Hotel Katuboard, Ward No. 60, Durg C.G. (As Per Annexure P/5)

... Petitioner

versus

- 1** - Municipal Corporation Durg Through Commissioner Municipal Corporation Durg C.G.
2 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Principle Secretary Department Of Rural And Urban Development, Mahanadi Bhawan Raipur C.G.
3 - Collector Durg District Durg C.G.

... Respondents

(Cause title, as taken from CIS)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Anurag Jha, Advocate.
For Resp. No. 1	:	Mr. Dheeraj Wankhede, Advocate.
For Resp. NO. 2 & 3	:	Mr. Atanu Ghosh, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

{Hon'ble Mr. Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi}

Order on Board

02/06/2026

Heard.

- 1.** Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner argued that without giving notice to the petitioner, eviction order dated 15.05.2026 (Annexure P-1) has been passed against him, wherein he has been held to be an encroacher of Government land, therefore, the proposed action to be taken against the petitioner is against the 'principle of natural justice'.



2. On this, learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 1, on instructions, would submit that the said notice was served to Shri Raja Bedi, who is operating the said Blue Diamond Hotel. However, he conceded the fact that no notice has been served to the petitioner.
3. In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a sole proprietor of said Blue Diamond Hotel, but notice has never been served to him.
4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
5. Having considered the contention putforth by learned counsel for both the parties, since no notice has been served to the petitioner, who is said to be Sole Proprietor of "Hotel Blue Diamond Hotel", therefore, the alleged order, if any, pertaining to the alleged encroachment by the petitioner upon the said government land/roadside is hereby quashed. However, the respondent No. 1 is at liberty to take necessary steps against the petitioner after following due process of law, if so advised.
6. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed to the extent indicated herein-above.
7. Pending interlocutory application (s), if any, stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge