CGHC010406892026

SAGRIKA AGRAWAL
Digitally signed by SAGRIKA AGRAWAL
Date: 2026.10.16 12:09:55 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WP227 No. 1337 of 2026

1 - Smt. Vinita Naidu W/o Rajkumar Naidu, Aged About 65 Years (Presently 72 Years) R/o A-601, Avenue-144, Near Medishine Hospital, Raipur Tehsil And District Raipur (C.G.).... Plaintiff

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - Yogesh Daharwal S/o Shri Sushant Kumar Daharwal, Aged About 42 Years (Presently 49 Years) R/o Nalghar Chowk, Raipur Tehsil And District Raipur (C.G.) ... Defendant No. 1

2 - Smt. Prerna Daharwal, W/o Yogesh Daharwal, Aged About 40 Years (Presently 47 Years) R/o Nalghar Chowk, Raipur Tehsil And District Raipur (C.G.) .... Defendant No.2

3 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through District Magistrate, Raipur (C.G.) ..... Defendant No. 3

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title taken from CIS)

For Petitioner(s)	**:**	Mr. Akshat Pandey, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	**:**	Mr. R. R. Pitwa, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon’ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J

Order on Board

15.10.2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India with the following reliefs :-

> “10.1 That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call the records of court below, for kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.
>
> 10.2 That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the learned 8th Civil Judge, Senior Division, Raipur to decide and conclude the Civil Suit within a period of 06 Months., forthwith, as per rule.
>
> 10.3 That, any other relief/order which may deem fit and just in the facts and circumstances of the case including award of the costs of the petition may be given.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the civil suit is pending since 2021 and till date the plaintiff’s evidence has not been recorded, therefore, the learned trial Court may be directed to expedite the proceeding of the trial.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the document annexed with the petition as well as order-sheets of learned trial Court.

4. From perusal of the order-sheets of learned trial Court it transpires that on 17.10.2023 (wrongly typed as 17.08.2023), issues have been framed and thereafter the case was fixed for recording of the evidence of plaintiff. On 08.12.2023, when the case was fixed for recording plaintiff’s evidence, on the application made by plaintiff, the case was adjourned. Again on 16.02.2024, 10.04.2024, 20.06.2024, 21.01.2025 and 24.03.2025 the date was adjourned for recording plaintiff’s evidence. Thereafter, on 06.05.2025, the plaintiff has filed an application under Order 6 Rule 17 of CPC and the date was again adjourned. Likewise, for one or other reason and by the request made

by the parties, the proceeding of the case was adjourned time to time, however, the plaintiff's evidence could not be recorded.

5. Since, the plaintiff himself is not vigilant in prosecuting is suit and not recording his evidence and sought time repeatedly, this Court is not inclined to direct the learned trial Court to decide the suit within the stipulated time. However, considering the fact that the suit is pending since 2021, it is expected that the learned trial Court shall expedite the trial of the suit and conclude the same as early as possible.

6. With the aforesaid observation, the present writ petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)

Judge

sagrika