



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 114 of 2026

1 - Ram Say (Dead) Through Lrs. S/o Gendi Caste Rajwar

1(A) Bhikhuram S/o Late Ram Say Rajwar Aged About 47 Years (Wrongly Mentioned As Bhilkhu Ram), R/o Village Pal Danauli Tahsil Odgi District Surajpur (C.G.)

2 - Rajau S/o Ramdhari Rajwar Aged About 90 Years R/o Village Khonpa, Tahsil Bhaiyathan, District Surajpur (C.G.)

... Petitioners.

Versus

1 - Jaypal S/o Late Sundar Say Aged About 65 Years Caste- Gond, R/o Village Pal Danauli Tahsil Odgi District Surajpur (C.G.)

2 - Gopal S/o Late Sundar Say Aged About 69 Years Caste- Gond, R/o Village Pal Danauli Tahsil Odgi District Surajpur (C.G.)

3 - The Commissioner (Revenue) Surguja Division Ambikapur (C.G.)

4 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Collector District Surajpur (C.G.)

... Respondents.

Order Sheet

22/01/2026	Mr. Ashok Kumar Shukla, Counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Nishi Kant Sinha, Adv on behalf of Mr. Shakti Raj Sinha, Counsel respondents No.1 and 2 through caveat. Mr. Sabyasachi Choubey, GA for respondents No.3 and 4./State.

	Since the respondents have already been represented by their counsel, service of notice is dispensed with. Heard on IA No.2-Application for exemption to file typed copy of Page Nos.37 & 57. On due consideration, IA No.2 is allowed and exemption is granted to file typed copy of the aforesaid pages. Also heard on IA No.1/2026 - Application for grant of ad-interim relief/stay. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has purchased the subject land after taking due permission from the Additional Collector, Surguja. After about 33 years the objection was raised by father of respondents No.1 & 2, namely, Sundar Say under Section 170B of the Chhattisgarh Land Revenue Code 1959 which was rejected by the concerned Sub Divisional Officer (SDO) and same was upheld by the concerned Collector, however, said orders were set-aside by the Board of Revenue. Thereafter, in compliance of order passed by this Court in WPC No.3830/2023 (Jailpal Vs. Ram Sai and Ors) on 28.10.2013, the case was remanded to the concerned SDO for reconsideration. Subsequently, the SDO has again rejected the objection of the respondent and in appeal also the Collector has affirmed the order passed by the SDO. However, on 10.11.2025 learned Commissioner, Surguja Division has set-aside the concurrent findings of the aforesaid two Authorities which is completely illegal and
--	--

	perverse. Hence, counsel prays that looking to aforesaid dispute between the parties, status quo may be maintained till pendency of this writ petition. Learned counsels for the respondents pray for sometime to file reply to main petition as well as on IA No.1 (application for grant of stay). On due consideration, 4 weeks' time is granted to file reply. However, considering the submission made by counsel for the petitioner, this Court observes that <u>status-quo, as it exists today, shall be maintained by both the parties, till the next date of hearing.</u> Meanwhile, Registry shall call original record from the Court of Additional Collector Surguja pertaining to Case No.224 of 1966-67, Class of Case-A/21 (Annexure-P/3). List this case after 4 weeks. Sd/- (Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi) Judge
--	---

Ajay