



2026:CGHC:14905
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1335 of 2026

1. Kholbahra S/o Sahorik Aged About 31 Years R/o Village Junwani, Post Meher, Tehsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 2. Lila Ram S/o Sahorik Aged About 50 Years R/o Village Junwani, Post Meher, Tehsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 3. Sahorik S/o Maniram Aged About 72 Years R/o Village Junwani, Post Meher, Tehsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
- ... Petitioners.**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
 2. The Collector, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 3. The Sub-Divisional Officer District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 4. The Tehsildar Pachpedi, Tehsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 5. Boharic S/o Maniram Aged About 75 Years R/o Village Junwani, Tehsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
 6. Nanha S/o Sahorik Aged About 41 Years R/o Village Junwani, Post Meher, Tehsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
- ... Respondents.**

(cause title downloaded from CIS Periphery)

For Petitioners	:	Smt. Renu Kochar, Advocate.
For Res No.1 to 4/ State	:	Mr. Saumitra Kesharwani, Panel Lawyer.

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

01/04/2026

1. This Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed challenging the order dated 19.09.2025 (Annexure-P/1) passed by the



Additional Tahsildar Pachpedi, District Bilaspur, whereby, the Additional Tahsildar has restrained the petitioners to raise construction over the subject land.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.3 - Sahorik and respondent No.5 - Bahorik and Ashorik are real brothers. Petitioners No.1 & 2 - Kholbahra and Lila Ram are son of petitioner No.3 - Sahorik. Earlier partition of family property has been effected between aforesaid three brothers. In that partition, subject land bearing Khasra No.169/12 Rakba 0.73 Hectares fallen in share of the petitioners. After partition, the petitioners have also purchased some portion of land of Adhorik. Counsel further submits that the petitioners started construction on their own land bearing Khasra No.162/12, but respondent No.5 Bahorik filed an application before the Additional Tahsildar Pachpedi, District Bilaspur claiming his share on the aforesaid land, on the basis of which, Tahsildar Pachpedi, District Bilaspur has passed impugned injunction order dated 19.09.2025 (Annexure-P/1), whereas he has no power to pass such injunction order particularly looking to the fact that there is private dispute between the petitioners and respondent No.5. Learned counsel further submits that in catena of decisions, this Court has held that the Revenue Court has no right to pass stay/injunction order in respect of private civil dispute between the parties. In view of such submission, she prays to quash the impugned order dated 19.09.2025 (Annexure-P/1).
3. Learned State counsel submits that appropriate order may be passed in this matter.
4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.



5. In the case of **Baisahu Ram (died) through LRs Vs. Khelawan Singh and ors. (WP227 No. 771/2013 decided on 24-7-2017)**, the Coordinate Bench of this Court has held that 'Order to grant injunction is surely vested in the jurisdictional civil court, revenue courts cannot grant order of injunction'. Similar view has also been taken by another Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Smt. Vandana Gupta Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others (WPC No. 235/2020 decided on 16-9-2021)**, in which various judgments have been discussed, thus, it is settled that, the Naib Tahsildar/Tahsildar has no jurisdiction to pass injunction order in civil dispute, particularly in title dispute pending between the parties.
6. In the present case, perusal of impugned order dated 19.09.2025 (Annexure-P/1) would show that the petitioners are raising construction over land bearing Khasra No.169/12 Area 0.073 Hectares situated at Village Junwani, Tahsil Pachpedi, District Bilaspur, against which, respondent No.5 Bahorik has filed an application claiming his share on the subject land. Hence, it is clear that there is title dispute between the petitioners and respondent No.5 which is civil in nature.
7. In view of the law laid down in aforesaid judgments and considering the nature of dispute, this Court is of the considered view that the Additional Tahsildar has no jurisdiction to interfere or pass injunction order in respect of private civil dispute between the parties.
8. Consequently, the impugned order dated 19.09.2025 (Annexure-P/1) is not sustainable and same is hereby quashed.
9. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge