2025:CGHC:61972

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 6720 of 2025

- O.P Singh S/o P.R. Singh Aged About 72 Years Retired Cashier/ Accountant, R/o Qtr. No. A/2, Rajya Parivahan Colony I.T.I., Rampur Korba, District - Korba Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Distt - Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Collector Korba, Distt - Korba Chhattisgarh
3. Sub Divisional Officer (R) Korba, Distt - Korba Chhattisgarh
4. Tahsildar Korba, Distt - Korba Chhattisgarh
5. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation Limited (Cidc Ltd.) Through Its Manager, Second Floor C.G., Kaushal Vikas Pradhikaran Bhawan, Old Police Headquarters Parisar, Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Rajnish Singh Baghel, Advocate.
For Respondents No. 1 to 4/State.	:	Mr. Kesav Gupta, Panel Lawyer.
For respondent No.5.		Mr. Saket Pandey, Advocate appears on behalf of Mr. Anup Majumdar, Advocate.

(Hon'ble Mr. Justice Narendra Kumar Vyas)

Order on Board

27/12/2025

1. The petitioner has filed this Writ Petition (C) under Article 226 of the Constitution of India challenging the notice dated 24-12-2025 (Annexure P/1) issued by the respondent No.4/ Tahsildar, Korba, District Korba by which the petitioner was directed to vacate the Government Quarter No. .A/2, Rajya Parivahan Colony, I.T.I., Rampur, District Korba within three days as he has been unauthorisedly occupying the said house.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that earlier the petitioner has filed Writ Petition (C) No. 5267 of 2025 wherein this Court vide order dated 9-10-2025 has directed the respondent No.1 Manager, CIDC, should deicide the representation of the petitioner (Annexure P/4) in accordance with law, rules and regulations expeditiously as soon aa possible, till then no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner, but the same has not been decided, still notice dated 24-12-2025 has been issued which is illegal and would pray for quashing of the notice dated 24-12-2025.
3. On the other hand, Mr. Saket Pandey, Advocate counsel for respondent No.5 would submit that the representation of the petitioner is likely to decide and even in the notice there is no order of taking coercive steps against the petitioner, as such this writ petition is premature and would pray for dismissal of the writ petition.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
5. Considering the fact that the interim order passed by this Court is already in operative in favour of the petitioner, it is directed that the respondent No.5 shall decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of three weeks from today and till then no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner for eviction and notice dated 24-12-2025 (Annexure P/1) will not be given effect till the representation is decided. It is also directed that the

adction contemplated as per notice dated 24-12-2025 will be final outcome of the decision taken by the respondent while deciding the representation.

6. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this writ petition is disposed of.

7. Pending interlocutory applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

Sd/-

(Narendra Kumar Vyas)
JUDGE

Raju

RAVVA SATYANARAYANA RAJU

Digitally signed by RAVVA SATYANARAYANA RAJU
Date: 2025.12.27 16:07:28 +0530