CGHC010106772019 2026:CGHC:44942

AMITA DUBEY

Digitally signed by AMITA DUBEY
Date: 2026.10.16 19:27:59 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

FA No. 169 of 2019

1 - Dinesh Thakur S/o Late Munshiram Thakur Aged About 58 Years R/o Jute Mill Road, Raigarh At Present Pratistha Heights, House No. 102, Rambhanta Road, In Front Of St. Michael School, Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

... Appellant

versus

1 - Bhupendra Thakur S/o Late Munshiram Thakur Aged About 47 Years R/o Jute Mill Road, Raigarh Tahsil And District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

2 - Bhupesh Thakur S/o Late Munshiram Thakur Aged About 44 Years R/o Jute Mill Road, Raigarh Tahsil And District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

3 - Smt. Kanta Devi W/o Banwarilal Kethalaya Aged About 65 Years R/o Behind Ganj, Kharsia, Tahsil Kharsia, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

4 - Smt. Sharda W/o Sompal Thakur Aged About 62 Years R/o Village Dulhara, Post And Tahsil Sahpur, District Muzaffarpur, U. P.

5 - Smt. Pratibha W/o Pawan Kumar Aged About 40 Years R/o Jute Mill Road, In Front Of Old Bus Stand, Raigarh Tahsil And District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

6 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Collector, Raigarh District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

For Appellant	:	None
For Res./State	:	Ms. Veetika Choubey, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput

Order On Board

16/10/2026

1. On 28.09.2026, none appeared on behalf of the appellant. On that date, the appeal was admitted for hearing, notice was directed to be issued to the respondents, and the matter was directed to be listed in the week after next. Thereafter, on 12.10.2026, when the matter was taken up, none appeared on behalf of the appellant. Accordingly, it was directed that, in the event of non-appearance on the next date of hearing, this Court may pass an appropriate order. Today, despite repeated calls, none appeared on behalf of the appellant, nor any representation is made on behalf of the appellant.

2. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is left with no option but to dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.

3. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-

(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge

Ami