



2026:CGHC:3522



2026:CGHC:3522

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 262 of 2026

1 - Smt. Ghurai Manjhi D/o Late Natthu Manjhi, W/o Shri Dilbodh Manjhi Aged About 45 Years Presently R/o Village - Bagdahi, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District- Raigarh C.G.

... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur C.G.

2 - The Commissioner, Bilaspur Division, District Bilaspur C.G.

3 - The Upper Commissioner, Bilaspur Division, District Bilaspur C.G.

4 - The Collector, Raigarh, District- Raigarh C.G.

5 - The Sub-Divisional Officer (Revenue), Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

6 - The Tahsildar, Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

7 - Minketan S/o Late Harishankar, Aged About 48 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

8 - Gajanand S/o Late Harishankar Aged About 46 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

9 - Kanhu S/o Late Harishankar Aged About 44 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

10 - Santoshi D/o Late Harishankar Aged About 41 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

11 - Smt. Dutiya Wd/o Late Harishankar Aged About 71 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

12 - Gaurishankar S/o Bhajoram Gond Aged About 71 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

13 - Suklamber S/o Ganeshram Aged About 27 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.



- 14** - Hemvati D/o Late Ganeshram Aged About 41 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 15** - Momvati D/o Late Ganeshram Aged About 41 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 16** - Bahartin W/o Late Ganeshram Aged About 63 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 17** - Prembai W/o Late Sirpati Gond Aged About 59 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 18** - Gulapi D/o Late Tilochan Aged About 25 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 19** - Arti D/o Late Tilochan Aged About 23 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 20** - Siromati W/o Late Tilochan Gond Aged About 47 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 21** - Devmati D/o Bhajoram Gond Aged About 54 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 22** - Tarik Giri S/o Late Madhu Giri Aged About 74 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 23** - Vishal Giri S/o Late Madhu Giri Aged About 62 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post-Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 24** - Khageshwar Giri S/o Late Madhu Giri Aged About 60 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 25** - Bisheshwar Giri S/o Late Madhu Giri Aged About 58 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.
- 26** - Jagdish Giri S/o Late Madhu Giri Aged About 55 Years R/o Village - Porda, Post- Porda, Tahsil- Gharghoda, District- Raigarh C.G.

... Respondents

(Cause title, as taken from CIS system)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Roop Ram Naik, Advocate
For State/Respondents No.1 to 6	:	Mr. Keshav Gupta, Govt. Advocate.

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

21/01/2026

1. Heard.
2. This petition has been preferred by petitioner under Article 226/227 of



the Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ/order/ direction against respondent State Authority/ respondent No. 5 to decide expeditiously 30 years pending application/proceeding under section 170 (B) (1) of C.G. Land Revenue Code and determine 3 point issues in view of order dated 31.07.1998 passed by the respondent No.2.

10.2) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ/order/direction against respondent State Authority/ respondent No. 2 to 3 to return back the Revenue Case No. 52/A-23/2015-16 to decide 30 years pending application/proceeding under section 170 (B) (1) of C.G. Land Revenue Code.

10.3) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ/ order/ direction against respondent State Authority/ respondent No. 2 to 3 and 5 decide the pending case with respect of the present parties within period of 2 months.

10.4) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue any other suitable writ/orders/directions in favour of the petitioner looking to the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner belongs to a tribal community. Father of the petitioner; namely Natthu Manjhi was an owner of the land bearing Khasra No.294, area 11.97 acres situated at Village Porda, Tahsil Gharghoda, District Raigarh (CG). That land was purchased by non-tribal private respondent, therefore, a Revenue Case No.151/34-23/1996-97 was registered by the Sub-Divisional



Officer (Revenue), Gharghoda, in which, the said land was directed to be returned to the petitioner/her father. That case was travelled in Appeal/Revision to the Collector and the Commissioner. The Commissioner remitted the matter to the SDO (R), Gharghoda with a direction to decide certain points. The record was also transmitted. Subsequently, again Appeal/Revision was preferred before the Collector and the Commissioner, hence the record was again called by them and the record is with the Commissioner, Bilaspur, Division Bilaspur pertaining to the Case No.५-23/2024-25 [E-Court No.202410990100037/५-23 (*Harishankar & Ors. vs. Natthu & Ors.*)]. He further submits that despite query made by petitioner, it was not informed to her that where the record is held up. But because of such apathy of respondent authorities, neither Revenue Case No.52/A-23/2015-16 (Old No.151/५-23/1996-97) is being decided by the SDO (R), Gharghoda nor the Commissioner is deciding Case No.५-23/2024-25 [E-Court No.202410990100037/५-23 (*Harishankar & Ors. vs. Natthu & Ors.*)]. Hence, learned counsel submits that this petition may be disposed of directing the SDO (R), Gharghoda and the Commissioner, Bilaspur, Division Bilaspur to decide aforesaid revenue cases expeditiously within a period specified by this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the State-respondents has no objection to the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner.
5. Perusal of record shows that the Revenue Case No.151/५-23/1996-97 (New No.52/A-23/2015-16) is pending consideration since about 30 years, despite that, it has not attained finality because of filing appeal/revision again and again by the parties. Despite that, the party has a right of expeditious hearing and disposal of the case.



6. Having considered long pendency of 30 years of aforesaid two cases, prayer made by petitioner is allowed. The Commissioner, Bilaspur, Division Bilaspur is directed to decide the Revenue Case No.अ-23/2024-25 [E-Court No.202410990100037/अ-23 (*Harishankar & Ors. vs. Natthu & Ors.*)], in accordance with law, expeditiously, within a period of 90 days from today. Thereafter, he is further directed to remit the original record to the SDO (R), Gharghoda immediately. It is further observed that after receiving original record, the SDO (Revenue), Gharghoda is directed to decide Revenue Case No.52/A-23/2015-16 (Old No.151/अ-23/1996-97) in accordance with law, within further period of 90 days.
7. With aforesaid observations and direction, this writ petition stands **disposed of**.
8. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge