


Single Bench

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWRIT PETITION (C) NO. 1304 OF 2009PETITIONERS

1. Dwakat Singh, S/o Manohar Sai, aged about 39 years.
2. Kailash Singh, S/o Bankat Singh, aged 34 years.
3. Santlal, S/o Khamman Singh, aged about 34 years.
4. Holi Das, S/o Mangal Das, aged about 35 years.
5. Baharan Singh, S/o Chandan Singh, aged about 37 years.
6. Sahadev Singh, S/o Karam Singh, aged about 34 years.
7. Lal Singh, S/o Ram Singh, aged about 38 years.
8. Meghnath, S/o Somnath, aged about 38 years.
9. Ranjit Singh, S/o Dhan Singh, aged about 38 years.
10. Chedilal, S/o Amrit Lal, aged about 37 years.
11. Shyam Lal, S/o Prem Sai, aged about 38 years.
12. Bandhan Singh, S/o Rammat Singh, aged about 34 years.
13. Dheerpal Singh, S/o Itwar Singh, aged about 38 years.
14. Harihar Singh, S/o Ram Singh, aged about 35 years.
15. Dhilbhod Singh, S/o Mohan Singh, aged about 34 years.
16. Sampat Singh, S/o Chatar Singh, aged about 19 years.
17. Bhuvan Singh, S/o Umed Singh, aged about 38 years.
18. Samal Sai, S/o Phool Sai, aged about 36 years.

PR. No. 1992/09
 Presented by S. R. S. Dhalwal
 02/02/09
 3/3/09 10:15 AM

RECEIVED COPY
 02/03/09
 CHHATTISGARH A.C. BILASPUR



5/1/09

19. Dharshan Singh, S/o Mehttar Singh, aged about 32 years.
20. Kamal Singh, S/o Samar Sai, aged about 31 years.
21. Devraj Singh, S/o Puran Singh, aged about 32 years.
22. Rekha Kumar, D/o Jaylal Soni, aged about 19 years.
23. Krishnapal Singh, S/o Babu Singh, aged about 32 years.
24. Raghuvar Singh, S/o Umed Singh, aged about 32 years.
25. Amar Singh, S/o Ratan Singh, aged about 39 years.
26. Prahlad Kumar, S/o Horilal Yadav, aged about 32 years.
27. Visambar Singh, S/o Dharam Singh, aged about 34 years.
28. Suryabhavan Singh, S/o Budhwar Singh, aged about 34 years.
29. Venkat Singh, S/o Laxman Singh, aged about 38 years.
30. Anand Ram, S/o Puniram Bariya, aged about 26 years.
31. Horilal, S/o Malguja, aged about 23 years.
32. Gajanand, S/o Santram, aged about 31 years.
33. Bhagwat Singh, S/o Lal Singh, aged about 37 years.
34. Chhattar Singh, S/o Itwar Singh, aged about 22 years.
35. Chtrapal Singh, S/o Ganga Singh, aged about 23 years.
36. Dhool Sai, S/o Chamra Sai, aged about 34 years.
37. Umend Ram, S/o Dileshwar Das, aged about 37 years.
38. Pyarelal, S/o Hadbad, aged about 34 years.



[Handwritten signature]

- 39. Shishupal, S/o Kuman Singh, aged about 34 years.
- 40. Madanlal, S/o Tiketram, aged about 24 years.
- 41. Gaya Ram, S/o Panchram, aged about 37 years.

All the petitioners are residents of Village Danganiyakhar, Post Barginagar, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba (CG).

Versus

RESPONDENTS

- 1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of Power, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (CG).
- 2. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Danganiya, Raipur (CG), through its Chairman.
- 3. Executive Engineer (Civil), Hasdeo Thermal Power Station, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Korba (West), District Korba (CG).
- 4. Additional Chief Engineer (Construction), Hasdeo Thermal Power Station, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Darri, District Korba (CG).
- 5. Chhattisgarh State Power Generation Company Limited, through Chief Engineer (Production), Hasdeo Thermal Power Station, Chhattisgarh State Power Generation Company Limited, Korba, (West), District Korba (CG).



CS/20

4

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

/



XI-HC

185

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

148

मामला क्रमांक W.P.C. 1304/09 सन् 201

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	<u>S.B.: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRITINKER DIWAKER</u> <u>23.04.2015:</u> Shri SRJ Jaiswal, counsel for the petitioners. Shri N. Naha Roy, Panel Lawyer for the State. None for other respondents. According to the petitioners, though they are entitled for employment in lieu of acquisition of their land by the authorities of the State Electricity Board, till date they have not been given such employment. Counsel for the petitioners submits that vide Annexure P/1, the case of some of the petitioners has been rejected by the respondent authorities without considering the existing policies and further, without considering the letter dated 5.9.2005 (Annexure P/5). He submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if at this stage the petitioners may be permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to file a mercy representation before respondent No.5 and a direction is issued to respondent No.5 to decide the same expeditiously. Counsel appearing for the State submits that it is for respondent No.5 and other authorities to consider the representation of the petitioners.	



मामला क्रमांक WP/1304/09 सन् 201

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश - 2 -	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	In view of above, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty. Needless to say, if any such representation is filed by the petitioners, the competent authority to decide the same strictly in accordance with law.	Sd/- Pritinker Diwaker Judge