

**HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH : JABALPUR  
DIVISION BENCH - SPL-II (Time 10:30 AM)**

**Daily Cause List dated : 20-01-2021**

**BEFORE: HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRAKASH SHRIVASTAVA & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIRENDER SINGH**

**Hearing through Video Conferencing**

**MOTION HEARING**

**[DIRECTION MATTERS]**

<b>SN</b>	<b>Case No</b>	<b>Petitioner / Respondent</b>	<b>Petitioner/Respondent Advocate</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>WP 22119/2011</b>	LALIT MITTAL Versus THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH	SIDDHARTH GUPTA, S.K.GARG, ARJITA GUPTA, MUNISH SINGH, VIPIN SINGH  ADVOCATE GENERAL, using 40 serverANKIT AGRAWAL[R-1][AG][R-2][AG] [R-3][AG]

LAND REVENUE , TENANCY & NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620  
Relief - TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DT. 08.03.2010 PASSED BY THE RES. NO. 3.

**{FIXED DATE (ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER) COVID-19} TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING REFERENCE QUESTION:-WHETHER  
THE SETTLEMENT COMMISSIONER, COLLECTOR OR SETTLEMENT OFFICER, WHO HIMSELF HAS PASSED THE  
ORDER, THINKS IT NECESSARY TO REVIEW SUCH ORDER AND HAS TAKEN A DECISION TO REVIEW THE ORDER AND  
INITIATED REVIEW CASE THEN HIS SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE IS STILL REQUIRED TO SEEK SANCTION IN PASSING THE  
FINAL ORDER IN REVIEW CASE? OR WHETHER REVIEW PROCEEDINGS WHICH ARE INITIATED BY THE SAME  
REVENUE OFFICER WHO HAS PASSED THE ORDER UNDER REVIEW THAN THE SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE IS NOT  
REQUIRED TO SEEK SANCTION TO PASS FINAL ORDER?**  
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND/OR 227 OF CONSTITUTION

**TOTAL CASES : 1 (with connected matters)**

**PR (J) / R (J-I) / R(J-II)**