



CGHC010518742025



2026:CGHC:36710

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 9 of 2026

Naya Raipur Development Authority (Now Atal Nagar Vikas Pradhikaran)
Through The Chief Executive Officer, Naya Raipur Development Authority,
Prayavas Bhawan, North Block, Sector 19, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur,
Chhattisgarh.

... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - Vikas Agrawal S/o Shri S. N. Agrawal Aged About 47 Years R/o Radiant
Public School, Nimora, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue,
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, District-
Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - The Collector Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Sub Divisional Officer Revenue Cum Land Acquisition Officer, Arang /
Abhanpur, Headquarter / District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... **Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Apurv Kurup, Senior Advocate alongwith Mr.
Anumesh Shrivastava, Advocate and Mr. Syed
Jayed Ziya Ali, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Ghanshyam Kashyap, Dy.G.A. for the State

For Intervener(s) : Mr. Aman Pandey, Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J.)

Order on Board

17/08/2026

1. This is an application for review of the order dated 04.04.2025 passed by this Court in WPC No. 2520 of 2017, whereby the award dated 31.12.2015 passed by respondent No.3/ Sub-Divisional Officer, Revenue-cum-Land Acquisition Officer, Aarang is declared void ab initio as the same has been passed after lapse of 12 months of initiation of land acquisition proceeding under the old Land Acquisition Act of 1894.
2. Learned Counsel appearing for the Review Petitioner would submit that the present petition has been filed seeking a limited clarification/ modification of the operative portion of the common order passed in WPC No. 2520 of 2017, strictly to the extent that the relief granted therein be confined only to the writ petitioners of the present case. It is submitted that the order, as it presently stands, is being construed and/or implemented in a manner so as to extend its benefit to persons who were not parties to the writ proceedings, namely other land oustees who neither assailed the acquisition proceedings nor reserved any right to challenge the same, and who, in fact, had accepted the compensation awarded to them. Such an interpretation, according to the Review Petitioner, gives rise to an error apparent on the face of the record, as it runs contrary to the settled principles governing writ jurisdiction that relief is ordinarily in persona and cannot be extended to non-parties. He would further submit that the subject land acquisition was undertaken for a duly notified public purpose, namely the planned development of Atal Nagar (Naya Raipur), and the review petitioner proceeded with development activities, leading to the creation of

substantial public infrastructure and third-party rights. Any extension or application of the impugned order beyond the petitioners of the writ petition of this case would not only cause grave prejudice to public interest and result in significant financial implications for the public exchequer, but would also disrupt the integrated and planned development of the capital city. Therefore, the operative part of the order dated 04.04.2025 passed in W.P.C. No. 2520/2017 may be clarified/modified and restricted its applicability to the extent of the petitioners of the said writ petition.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State has submitted that quashing of the land acquisition proceeding may be restricted to the extent of the petitioner of the said writ petition.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the interveners would submit that the NRDA again started the proceeding for purchasing the land of the petitioner under Nava Raipur Atal Nagar Vikas Pradhikaran and issued a notice on 15.09.2025 to purchase the land under the mutual consent scheme, therefore, the interveners may be heard in review petition also.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the writ petition and the review petition.
6. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties and perusal of the record of the writ petition and review petition, and also in the facts and circumstances of the case, the review petition deserves to be allowed and is hereby allowed. In the order dated 04.04.2025 passed in W.P.C. No. 2520/2017, the following

paragraph No.103 be added and read with the original order as under:-

“103. It is made clear that the benefit of such declaration shall be confined only to the petitioner in the present writ petition, who has approached this Court and pursued his remedies in accordance with law. The said finding shall not ensure to the benefit of non-parties or other landholders who have neither challenged the acquisition proceedings nor sought any relief before this Court. Accordingly, the applicability of this order stands restricted only to the writ petitioner herein.”

7. With respect to the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the interveners, it is observed that the interveners were not the party before the writ Court, and therefore, in the review petition filed by the NRDA who were the respondent in the writ Court, the intervention application can not be allowed, however, they are at liberty to take their appropriate remedy available to him in accordance with law.
8. With the aforesaid modification in the order dated 04.04.2025 passed in WPC No. 2520 of 2017, the present review petition is allowed.
9. Copy of this order be placed in the record of WPC No. 2520 of 2017 (Vikas Agrawal Vs State of Chhattisgarh and others).

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
JUDGE