



2026:CGHC:29880



CGHC010261742026



2026:CGHC:29880

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 3664 of 2026**

Tekchand S/o- Anjori Lal Chandrakar Aged About 52 Years R/o- Bundeli,
Tehsil And P.S. Mungeli District- Mungeli (C.G.)

... Petitioner**versus**

- 1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Secretary, Department Of Revenue
And Disaster Management , Mahanadi Bhawan , Atal Nagar (Naya
Raipur) District- Raipur (C.G.)
- 2** - Collector Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 3** - Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 4** - Tahsildar Mungeli, District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 5** - Smt. Gulaba Bai Wd/o- Late Anjorilal, Aged About 72 Years R/o-
Village Bundeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 6** - Smt. Gitabai W/o- Shri Vrindaprakash Kulmitra, Aged About 52 Years
D/o- Late Anjorilal , R/o- Village Khatoliya, Tahsil Takhatpur, District-
Bilaspur (C.G.)
- 7** - Smt. Savitabai W/o- Shri Santu Kashyap Aged About 44 Years D/o-
Late Anjorilal, R/o- Village Dhobdhatti, Tahsil - Lormi District- Mungeli
(C.G.)



- 8** - Tikamchand S/o- Late Anjorilal, Aged About 50 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 9** - Ashok Kumar S/o- Late Anjorilal, Aged About 47 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 10** - Jagkumar S/o- Late Anjorilal, Aged About 42 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 11** - Smt. Chandraprabha D/o- Late Anjorilal, Aged About 45 Years W/o- Suresh Kumar Chandrakar, R/o- Village Navagaon Khurd, Tehsil Dadhi, District- Bemetara (C.G.)
- 12** - Smt. Madhulata, D/o Late Anjorilal, Aged About 40 Years W/o- Ashok Kumar @ Biran Chandrakar, R/o- Village Mahka, Tahsil Pandariya, District- Kabirdham (C.G.)
- 13** - Smt. Santoshi Chandrakar W/o- Tikam Chandrakar, Aged About 47 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 14** - Karan Chandrakar S/o- Tikam Chandrakar, Aged About 30 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 15** - Smt. Amritbai Chandrakar W/o- Ashok Chandrakar, Aged About 45 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)
- 16** - Vikas Chandrakar S/o- Jag Chandrakar Aged About 21 Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District- Mungeli (C.G.)



17 - Himanshu Chandrakar S/o-Ashok Chandrakar, Aged About 23
Years R/o- Village Bundeli, P.S. City Kotwali Mungeli, Tahsil And District-
Mungeli (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Pravin Kumar Tulsyan, Advocate
For State	:	Dr. Saurabh Kumar Pande, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Amitendra Kishore Prasad, Judge

Order on Board

15.07.2026

1. By filing the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has called in question the legality and validity of the order dated 25.05.2026 passed by respondent No.3/Sub-Divisional Officer (Revenue), Mungeli, District Mungeli, whereby the petitioner's application seeking separate registration/Rin Pustika in respect of the subject lands has been rejected. The petitioner has prayed for following relief(s):-

"10.1 Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, quashing and setting aside the order dated 25.05.2026 passed by the learned Sub-Divisional Officer (Revenue), Mungeli, District Mungeli, whereby the Petitioner's application for separate registration/rin pustika in respect of the subject lands was rejected.



10.2 Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the Respondent authorities to grant separate registration in favour of the Petitioner for sale/procurement of paddy cultivated over the lands in his possession, namely Khasra Nos. 127/4, 164, 184, 185/2, 186/2, 199/1, 199/2, 326, 256 and 366/7 situated at Village Bundeli and Khasra Nos. 42 and 44 situated at Village Ghorpura, on the basis of the Mutual Family Arrangement/Understanding, subject to the final outcome of the pending civil suit.

10.3 Pass any other writ, order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, including the award of costs of the present petition in favour of the Petitioner."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in peaceful, continuous and exclusive possession of the subject lands which had fallen to his share pursuant to a mutual family arrangement arrived at amongst the legal heirs of late Anjori Lal. It is submitted that although the petitioner is the actual cultivator of the lands and has been raising paddy crops thereon, the registration for sale of paddy at the Government Procurement Centre continues to stand in the name of respondent No.8, thereby depriving the petitioner of the benefit of selling his agricultural produce.



3. Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner never sought adjudication of title or partition before the revenue authorities, as the civil suit instituted by the parties is already pending before the competent Civil Court. The relief sought before respondent No.3 was confined only to grant of separate registration/Rin Pustika for the limited purpose of enabling the petitioner to sell the paddy cultivated by him. It is argued that respondent No.3 has rejected the petitioner's application solely on the ground of pendency of the civil suit without appreciating the limited nature of the prayer made by the petitioner.
4. It is further contended that the impugned order is arbitrary, non-speaking and mechanically passed without independent application of mind. Learned counsel also submits that similarly situated co-sharers have already been granted separate registration on the basis of the very same family arrangement, and therefore denial of identical relief to the petitioner is discriminatory and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. It is, thus, prayed that the impugned order deserves to be quashed and respondent authorities be directed to grant separate registration/Rin Pustika in favour of the petitioner.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, opposes the writ petition and submits that the impugned order has been passed in accordance with law. It is submitted that since the dispute relating to the subject property is already pending before the competent



Civil Court, respondent No.3 has rightly declined to grant the relief sought by the petitioner and no interference is called for in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that the petitioner himself admits that a comprehensive civil suit seeking declaration, partition and permanent injunction in respect of the subject property is pending adjudication before the competent Civil Court. The rights and shares of the parties over the subject lands are, therefore, yet to attain finality. The competent revenue authority, while considering the petitioner's application for separate registration/Rin Pustika, has taken note of the pendency of the civil proceedings and has declined to grant the relief sought.
8. This Court, while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, would not ordinarily interfere with such an order, particularly when the dispute is intrinsically connected with the rights of the parties over the property which are already sub judice before the Civil Court. Any direction issued by this Court for grant of separate registration may have a bearing upon the inter se rights of the parties, which are required to be adjudicated by the competent Civil Court on the basis of evidence. The writ



jurisdiction cannot be invoked to circumvent or render nugatory the adjudicatory process already pending before the Civil Court. Since the petitioner has an efficacious remedy before the Civil Court where all questions relating to possession, partition and consequential rights are to be determined, no case for interference with the impugned order is made out.

9. Accordingly, finding no merit in the writ petition, the same deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**.
10. It is, however, observed that the dismissal of the present writ petition shall not prejudice the rights and contentions of the petitioner in the pending civil proceedings, which shall be decided independently on their own merits and in accordance with law, uninfluenced by any observation made herein.
11. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Yogesh