

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

Daily Cause List dated : 09-02-2021

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA

Hearing through Video Conferencing

MOTION HEARING

[DIRECTION MATTERS]

SN	Case No	Petitioner / Respondent	Petitioner/Respondent Advocate
1	WP 15435/2018	SMT. JYOTI JAIN Versus M/S HAZI COMPANY (A PARTNERSHIP FIRM)	MADHUSUDAN DWIVEDI, ABHISHEK BAJPAL, AKASH VIJAYVARGIYA

ADVOCATE GENERAL, AJINKYA PATIL[R-1],
LOKENDRA PAWAR[R-1], RISHIRAJ UPADHYAY[R-1],
PAWAN SACHDEV[R-1], SANJAY PATHAK[R-1],
SHANTANU VAKTE[R-1], VANDANA RATHORE[R-1],
VISHAL MODIWAL[R-1], NILESH AGRAWAL[R-1],
ARUN ARORA[R-1], VINOD KAUSHAL[R-2], ANURAG
BAIJAL[R-2], HARSHWARDHAN SINGH[R-2][R-3]
[R-3][R-3][R-4][R-4][R-4][R-5][R-5][R-5][R-6][R-6]

LAND REVENUE , TENANCY & NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land
Revenue Code 1959-14620

CIVIL PROCEDURE & LIMITATION-11300 - Code of Civil Procedure, 1908-11301 - WRIT AGAINST
ORDER OF SUBORDINATE COURT U/ARTICLE 227.

Relief - TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER ANN P/13

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ORDER ON THE FOLLOWING
QUESTIONS: (I) WHETHER, THE REVENUE COURT CAN AMEND AN ENTRY IN
THE REVENUE RECORD AT A DISTANCE OF TIME OF 25/16 YEARS WHILE
CIVIL DISPUTE OF TITLE TO THE PROPERTY BETWEEN THE PARTIES IS
PENDING, BASED ON A FINDING IN A DIFFERENT SUIT THAT POWER OF
ATTORNEY HOLDER DID NOT HOLD LAWFUL POWER OF ATTORNEY WHILE
EXECUTED PREVIOUS SALE DEEDS AT DIFFERENT POINTS OF TIME, BUT
NEITHER THE PETITIONER WAS PARTY TO THE SAID SUIT NOR THE SALE
DEED IN QUESTION WAS THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE SUIT. AND (II)
WHETHER THE BOARD OF REVENUE EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION WHILE
EXERCISING THE REVISIONAL JURISDICTION UNDER SECTION 50 OF THE
CODE REGARD BEING HAD TO THE PROVISIONS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION
111 OF THE CODE WHILE SETTING ASIDE THE ORDERS OF SDO DATED
31.01.2014 AND ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER DATED 20.05.2014.? (NOTE:- (1)
KIND ATTENTION IS INVITED ON HON.THE CHIEF JUSTICE ORDER
DTD.18-1-2021)**

01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND/OR 227 OF CONSTITUTION

1.1	WP 16793/2018	GANGOTRI DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD.	MADHUSUDAN DWIVEDI
------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------

Linked (4)

**WP/15435/2018
(M)**

Versus

M/S HAZI COMPANY (A
PARTNERSHIP FIRM)

LAND REVENUE , TENANCY & NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land
Revenue Code 1959-14620

CIVIL PROCEDURE & LIMITATION-11300 - Code of Civil Procedure, 1908-11301 - WRIT AGAINST
ORDER OF SUBORDINATE COURT U/ARTICLE 227.

Relief - to set aside the impugned order dated 04/04/2018 ann.p/17

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ORDER ON THE FOLLOWING
QUESTIONS: (I) WHETHER, THE REVENUE COURT CAN AMEND AN ENTRY IN
THE REVENUE RECORD AT A DISTANCE OF TIME OF 25/16 YEARS WHILE
CIVIL DISPUTE OF TITLE TO THE PROPERTY BETWEEN THE PARTIES IS
PENDING, BASED ON A FINDING IN A DIFFERENT SUIT THAT POWER OF
ATTORNEY HOLDER DID NOT HOLD LAWFUL POWER OF ATTORNEY WHILE
EXECUTED PREVIOUS SALE DEEDS AT DIFFERENT POINTS OF TIME, BUT
NEITHER THE PETITIONER WAS PARTY TO THE SAID SUIT NOR THE SALE
DEED IN QUESTION WAS THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE SUIT. AND (II)
WHETHER THE BOARD OF REVENUE EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION WHILE
EXERCISING THE REVISIONAL JURISDICTION UNDER SECTION 50 OF THE
CODE REGARD BEING HAD TO THE PROVISIONS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION
111 OF THE CODE WHILE SETTING ASIDE THE ORDERS OF SDO DATED**

Daily Cause List dated : 09-02-2021

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA

**31.01.2014 AND ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER DATED 20.05.2014.?
01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND/OR 227 OF CONSTITUTION**

1.2 **Linked (4)** **WP 16908/2018** GANGOTRI DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD. MADHUSUDAN DWIVEDI, ABHISHEK BAJPAL, AKASH VIJAYVARGIYA

**WP/15435/2018
(M)**

Versus

M/S HAZI COMPANY (A
PARTNERSHIP FIRM)

, AJINKYA PATIL[CAVEAT], PAWAN
SACHDEV[CAVEAT], VANDANA RATHORE[CAVEAT],
SANJAY PATHAK[CAVEAT], SHANTANU
VAKTE[CAVEAT], ARUN ARORA[CAVEAT],
LOKENDRA PAWAR[R-1][R-1], RISHIRAJ
UPADHYAY[R-1][R-1][R-1][R-1], NILESH
AGRAWAL[R-1][R-1], KUSHAGRA JAIN[R-2][R-3]
[R-4][R-7]

LAND REVENUE , TENANCY & NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620

CIVIL PROCEDURE & LIMITATION-11300 - Code of Civil Procedure, 1908-11301 - WRIT AGAINST ORDER OF SUBORDINATE COURT U/ARTICLE 227.

Relief - quash the impugned order dated 04/04/2018 ann.p/16

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ORDER ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: (I) WHETHER, THE REVENUE COURT CAN AMEND AN ENTRY IN THE REVENUE RECORD AT A DISTANCE OF TIME OF 25/16 YEARS WHILE CIVIL DISPUTE OF TITLE TO THE PROPERTY BETWEEN THE PARTIES IS PENDING, BASED ON A FINDING IN A DIFFERENT SUIT THAT POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER DID NOT HOLD LAWFUL POWER OF ATTORNEY WHILE EXECUTED PREVIOUS SALE DEEDS AT DIFFERENT POINTS OF TIME, BUT NEITHER THE PETITIONER WAS PARTY TO THE SAID SUIT NOR THE SALE DEED IN QUESTION WAS THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE SUIT. AND (II) WHETHER THE BOARD OF REVENUE EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION WHILE EXERCISING THE REVISIONAL JURISDICTION UNDER SECTION 50 OF THE CODE REGARD BEING HAD TO THE PROVISIONS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 111 OF THE CODE WHILE SETTING ASIDE THE ORDERS OF SDO DATED 31.01.2014 AND ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER DATED 20.05.2014.? 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND/OR 227 OF CONSTITUTION**

1.3 **Linked (4)** **WP 23215/2018** RAMESH NAGAR RAVINDRA SINGH CHHABRA, GAURAV CHHABRA, MANISH VERMA, ANITA PATHAK, GURNEET CHAWLA, MUDIT MAHESHWARI, KANISHKA GUPTA

**WP/15435/2018
(M)**

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA
PRADESH

ADVOCATE GENERAL, RAVINDRA
MAHESHWARI[R-3], RISHIRAJ UPADHYAY[R-3],
VISHAL MODIWAL[R-3], ASHISH SHARMA[R-3],
NILESH AGRAWAL[R-3], DINESH KUMAR
MAHESHWARI[R-3], ANURAG BAIJAL[R-4], VINOD
KAUSHAL[R-4], HARSHWARDHAN SINGH[R-4][R-5]
[R-5][R-5][R-6][R-6][R-6][R-7][R-7][R-7][R-8][R-8]

LAND REVENUE , TENANCY & NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620

Relief - SET ASIDE THE ORDER DT.04/04/2018(ANN,P-7)

{FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR ORDER ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: (I) WHETHER, THE REVENUE COURT CAN AMEND AN ENTRY IN THE REVENUE RECORD AT A DISTANCE OF TIME OF 25/16 YEARS WHILE CIVIL DISPUTE OF TITLE TO THE PROPERTY BETWEEN THE PARTIES IS PENDING, BASED ON A FINDING IN A DIFFERENT SUIT THAT POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER DID NOT HOLD LAWFUL POWER OF ATTORNEY WHILE EXECUTED PREVIOUS SALE DEEDS AT DIFFERENT POINTS OF TIME, BUT NEITHER THE PETITIONER WAS PARTY TO THE SAID SUIT NOR THE SALE DEED IN QUESTION WAS THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE SUIT. AND (II) WHETHER THE BOARD OF REVENUE EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION WHILE EXERCISING THE REVISIONAL JURISDICTION UNDER SECTION 50 OF THE CODE REGARD BEING HAD TO THE PROVISIONS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 111 OF THE CODE WHILE SETTING ASIDE THE ORDERS OF SDO DATED 31.01.2014 AND ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONER DATED 20.05.2014.?**

Daily Cause List dated : 09-02-2021

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA

[01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND/OR 227 OF CONSTITUTION](#)

TOTAL CASES : 4 (with connected matters)

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