

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

WP No. 162 of 2026

(RAMAVTAR SONI Vs THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS)

Dated : 06-01-2026

*Shri Siddharth Gulatee - Sr. Advocate with Ms. Tulika Gulatee -
Advocate for the petitioner.*

Shri Prabhanshu Shukla - Govt. Advocate for the respondents / State.

Issue notice to the respondents on payment of process fee within seven working days by RAD mode, failing which, this petition shall stand dismissed without further reference to the Court.

Heard on the question of interim relief.

Counsel for the petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to Annexure-P/9, whereby the application filed under Section 32 of the MPLRC by the private respondent seeking relief granting injunction in his favour against the petitioner. The said application was rejected by the Tehsildar vide order dated 16.3.2022 (Annexure-P/12). The matter travelled up to the Collector and vide order dated 27.10.2022 (Annexure-P/14), the Collector has also upheld the order passed by the Tehsildar holding that the proceedings under Section 32 of the MPLRC are not meant for all these purposes to settle the private dispute. However, a liberty was granted to the private respondent to initiate proceedings under Section 250 of MPLRC, in case, any encroachment is found to be done by the petitioner and a liberty was also granted to the authority to initiate proceedings under Section 248 of MPLRC, if it is found government land. However, no such application under

section 250 of MPLRC was filed by the private respondent. Thereafter, an application under Sections 11 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act was filed by the private respondent pointing out non-compliance of the order passed by the Collector, in which, cognizance has been taken by the Collector vide impugned order dated 29.12.2025.

The State counsel has made an attempt to justify the order passed by the Collector. However, he could not explain that how the contempt application filed on behalf of the private respondent was maintainable in view of the fact that he has not initiated any proceedings under Section 250 of the MPLRC as the application under Section 32 of the MPLRC filed by the private respondent was rejected by the authorities and there was no challenge by the private respondent coupled with the fact that there was a specific direction by the Collector to carry out an enquiry. Whether any enquiry was carried out after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner is also not reflected.

Under these circumstances, the effect and operation of the impugned order dated 29.12.2025 passed by the Collector, Katni (Annexure-P/1) is stayed till the next date of hearing and further proceedings with respect to the case pending before the Collector are also stayed till the next date of hearing.

List after four weeks for consideration.

(VISHAL MISHRA)
JUDGE