



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 6487 of 2025

Kevalram S/o Shikariram Aged About 49 Years R/o Village- Bakela, P.O.
Kukdur, Block- Pandariya Distt- Kabirdham (C.G.)

... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Chief Secretary, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur,
District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Secretary Water Resource Department Mantralaya, Naya Raipur District-
Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management Mantralaya
Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

4 - Collector Kabirdham District- Kabirdham (C.G.)

5 - Sdo, Water Resource Department Pandariya District- Kabirdham (C.G.)

6 - Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Pandariya District- Kabirdham (C.G.)

... **Respondent(s)**

Order Sheet

19/12/2025	Ms. Rajni Soren, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Satish Gupta, Govt. Advocate for the State. Heard.



Issue notice to respondents.

Mr. Satish Gupta Govt. Advocate accepts notice for respondents. Hence, PF is not required to be paid for issuance of notice to respondents. Learned counsel for the State/respondents prays for and is granted three weeks time to file reply.

Also heard on IA No.1 which is an application for grant of interim relief.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is owner of small piece of agricultural land situated at village Bakela. Earlier according to the information gathered by petitioner, respondent -Water Resources Department has submitted project for construction of underground canal for which petitioner has also given consent as his land above the canal will remain as it is and he will be able to cultivate his land. However, subsequently, State Govt. has changed the policy and has decided to construct open canal passing over the land of petitioner also. However, no acquisition proceedings have been initiated for acquiring land of petitioner under the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short "*Act of 2013*"). Petitioner has also not given consent to sell his land under the Mutual Purchase of Land Policy 2016.

Learned counsel for the State opposes submission of learned counsel for the petitioner, However, he submits that about more than 50% of work of construction of canal below the land of petitioner has been completed. Learned counsel for the State, upon instructions of the officer present in the Court, submits that petitioner has not given his consent and no acquisition proceeding has been initiated .

In the aforementioned facts of case, let status quo as it exists today with respect to land of petitioner shall be maintained till the next date of hearing.

Respondents- State will be at liberty to initiate proceedings



of acquisition in accordance with law, if they so desire.

List this case in the week commencing **12.01.2026**.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge