



1

WP-35080-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRANAY VERMA

ON THE 4th OF SEPTEMBER, 2025WRIT PETITION No. 35080 of 2025

*HOPE TEXTILES LIMTIED A COMPANY INCORPORATED AND
REGISTERED UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT AND OTHERS*

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Ramesh Kumar Saboo - Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Anand Soni appearing on behalf of Advocate General[r-1].
.....

ORDER

By this petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners have challenged the order dated 20.08.2025 (Annexure P/57) passed by the Collector, District Indore whereby its lease has been cancelled.

02. Learned counsel for the respondents has raised a preliminary objection as regards maintainability of the petition on ground of availability of alternate remedy to the petitioners to prefer an appeal before the appellate authority under the provisions of Section 44(1) of M.P. Land Revenue Code, 1959.

03. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the impugned order is wholly illegal and without jurisdiction hence writ petition against the same deserves to be entertained.

04. From a perusal of the impugned order, it is observed that the same



is a detailed and a considered order and has taken into consideration all the facts and circumstances of the case in detail hence it cannot be said that the same has been passed without application of judicial mind. The Additional Collector as per the notification dated 10.02.2003 of the Revenue Department of the State Government is the competent authority in respect of all matters as regards land allotment hence it cannot be said that the order has been passed without jurisdiction.

05. The impugned order is an original order passed under the provisions of the Code namely Section 181/182 thereof. Against the same, an appeal would certainly be maintainable before the appellate authority. Various disputed questions of facts are involved in this petition as is clear from the record hence, in my opinion, it is not a fit case for entertaining this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in view of availability of such a remedy.

06. Thus, in view of the aforesaid, this petition is declined to be entertained and is accordingly dismissed reserving liberty to the petitioners to resort to the remedy as may be available under the law.

(PRANAY VERMA)
JUDGE

Shilpa