

(2018) 06 CHH CK 0176

Chhattisgarh High Court

Case No: Writ Petition (C) No. 869 Of 2012

Baijnath Agrawal

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Chhattisgarh And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: June 27, 2018

Hon'ble Judges: P. Sam Koshy, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Ashish Surana, Shashank Thakur

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

P. Sam Koshy, J

1. The issue involved in the present writ petition is in respect of the acquisition of the surface right/right to use of the property of the petitioner by the

State Government of laying of the underground pipeline for carrying water to respondent No.4-industry.

2. It is an specific averment made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in the course of the execution of the project, the land of the petitioner

has not been used and that the proposed pipeline has been laid from a property besides the land of the petitioner and that the land of the petitioner is no

longer required for use by the State Government for taking pipeline to respondent no.4-industry. According to the petitioner, since the land of the

petitioner has not been used, the very purpose of the acquisition of the said property gets frustrated. The respondents are supposed to drop the entire

acquisition proceeding initiated in this regard.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that so far as the petitioner's possession over the property is concerned it is still in possession of

the petitioner but he is unable to develop the said property by virtue of the said acquisition proceeding initiated by the State Government.

4. The respondents in the instant case have filed their reply and in the reply they have admitted the fact that the land of the petitioner has not been

used for the purpose of laying of the pipeline and that it is nowhere required for the purpose for which the acquisition was initiated.

5. Given the facts and circumstances, the only issue which is now left is that the respondents who have initiated the acquisition proceedings so far as

the land of the petitioner is concerned are suppose to drop the said proceeding.

6. In spite of the State Counsel making efforts to seek instructions from the competent authorities for an outer limit within which the proceeding can

be finalized, the State Counsel could not get any instructions in this regard. Thus, this Court is left with no option but to dispose of the present writ

petition with a specific direction to respondents no. 2 & 3 to ensure that the acquisition proceeding which was initiated so far as the petitioner is

concerned since the land is no longer required as per their reply for the purpose for which the acquisition proceeding had been initiated the same

should be dropped at the earliest by passing an order and finalizing the issue.

7. Let respondent no.3 take necessary steps and efforts within a period of four months from today within which the proceeding for dropping the

acquisition proceeding so far as the petitioner's property is concerned is finalized. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to communicate the

order of this Court to respondents no. 2 & 3 at the earliest.

8. The writ petition thus stands allowed and disposed of accordingly in the light of the observations made in the preceding paragraphs.