

(2018) 06 CHH CK 0085
Chhattisgarh High Court
Case No: WA No. 536 Of 2018

Tilaknath

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Chhattisgarh And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: June 19, 2018

Hon'ble Judges: Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, CJ; Parth Prateem Sahu, J

Bench: Division Bench

Advocate: Aman Tamboli, Prafull N. Bharat

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, CJ

1. We have elaborately heard the learned counsel for the Appellant - writ petitioner on different aspects of this appeal instituted against the judgment

of the learned Single Judge refusing to interfere with the cancellation of transfer of land which was under lease granted by the Government. We have

also heard the learned Additional Advocate General.

2. The learned Single Judge has decided two issues against the Appellant on the basis of materials and admitted facts. The land was leased by the

Government to a particular person. His legal representative transferred that land to the Appellant - Tilaknath. Admittedly, that transfer was in violation

of the condition of the grant of lease to the effect that any transfer without prior permission of the Collector would be void. The second aspect of the

case is that the land involved in this litigation is admittedly recorded as ""Bade Jhad Ka Jangal"". The said land could not have been transferred through

lease by the Government even to the so called predecessor of the Appellant. This is the effect of the provisions of the Forest (Conservation) Act,

1980 as interpreted and laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in T.N. Godavarman Thirumulkpad v. Union of India and others (1997) 2 SCC 267

which position has been followed in later precedents handed down by the Apex Court as well.

3. Looking at the quality of findings in the impugned judgment and the basic facts and materials as well as the judicial precedents referred to by the

learned Single Judge, we do not find our way to hold that the impugned judgment is vitiated on any count warranting interference through an intra

Court appeal. Hence, this writ appeal fails. The same is accordingly dismissed.