

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT INDORE**

**BEFORE**

**HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRANAY VERMA**

**ON THE 25<sup>th</sup> OF JANUARY, 2024**

**WRIT PETITION No. 23434 of 2023**

**BETWEEN:-**

**BHERULAL @ NAGULAL S/O NANURAM JI  
SURYAWANSHI, AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,  
OCCUPATION: SERVICE R/O DHARIYAKHEDI  
TEHSIL MANDSAUR AT PRESENT BSNL COLONY  
MANDSAUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**

**.....PETITIONER**

**(BY SHRI LOKENDRA SINGH JHALA - ADVOCATE)**

**AND**

- 1. COLLECTOR DISTT. MANDSAUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 2. BHU PRABANDHAK ADHIKARI, DISTRICT: MANDSAUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 3. JILA PANJIYAK REGISTRAR RAJASVA MANDSAUR, DISTRICT: MANDSAUR (MADHYA PRADESH)**
- 4. MUKHYA SACHIV MADHYA PRADESH SHASAN RAJASVA VIBHAG SATPURA BHAWAN, BHOPAL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

**.....RESPONDENTS**

**(BY MS. ASHI VAIDYA – PANEL LAWYER )**

---

*This petition coming on for admission this day, the court passed  
the following:*

**ORDER**

Learned counsel for the petitioner is heard on the question of admission.

02. By this petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:-

- 1- ;g fd iH/h'kuj dks ukckfyx voLFkk ea e-lk iz'kk u ds inkf/kdkjh ds }kjk oakt Hke is oap fd;s tkus ij ,oa Hke dks iath ds tjh;sdw jphr nLrkost r\$kj dj foØ; fd;s tkus ij ,oa ekstk xke /kkj; k[kMh ea fLFkr Hke ea iH/h'kuj ds uke gksr gq dw jpuk dj vU; ds uke foØ; jftLVh djrs tuk vijk/k dh Jsh ea gks is fof/k dk; bkg fd;s tkus dk vns'k inku djus dh dik dj
- 2- ;g fd iH/h'kuj dks e-iz }kjk jktLo inkf/kdkjh ,oa ftyk dyDVj eUnl g ,oa e-iz 'kk u is dEiu'kd u fnyk;s tkus dk vns'k inku djus dh dik dj
- 3- ;g fd ekuuh; U;k;ky; ;kfpdkdrk dks tks mfr le>s iR; FkZ is l gk; rk inku djus dh dik dj

03. From the relief claimed by the petitioner and the facts as pleaded by him, it appears that his grievance is that the land which was recorded in his name during his minority has been sold depriving him of the income therefrom. The same was done on the basis of a forged *Namantaran Panji* and by preparing forged documents by the Revenue Officers without his knowledge. The same is also a criminal offence.

04. From the facts as pleaded by the petitioner himself, it is apparent that the alleged illegality occurred 59 years ago. His grievance that his land by preparing a forged *Namantaran Panji* has been deprived from him by the Officers of the State Government and has been sold which amounts to a criminal offence are all matters which are disputed questions of facts. From the entire facts narrated by the petitioner, it does not appear that they are in any matter admitted facts.

05. The pleading as made by the petitioner in this petition is absolutely vague and from the same nothing can be ascertained. The relief which has been claimed for directing legal action against the revenue authorities and the Officers of the State Government cannot be granted in a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India particularly when no finding to that effect has been given by any competent Court of law. This Court certainly is not the forum for the petitioner to raise his grievances as raised by him in this petition. The prayer for compensation made by the petitioner can only be granted to him if the allegations levelled by him are found proved. There is nothing on record to show that any such finding has been recorded in any duly instituted proceedings by the petitioner.

06. Thus, in view of the facts as pleaded by the petitioner and the relief sought for by him, this petition involving disputed questions of facts is not liable to be entertained and is accordingly dismissed reserving liberty to the petitioner to resort to such remedy as may be available to him under the law.

**(PRANAY VERMA)**  
**JUDGE**

Shilpa