

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WP227 No. 561 of 2015

1. Yugal Maniklal Bhattad S/o Late Maniklal Bhattad Aged About 60 years R/o Shiv Kuti, Behind Maheshwari Panchayat Bhawan, Terkdi Road, Sitabuldi, Nagpur, Maharashtra Pin 440012

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh Human Rights Commission Near Old Mantralaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Chairman, Coal India Limited, Having Address At Coal Bhawan, 10, Netaji Subhash Chandra Road, Kolkata- 700001
3. Chief Managing Director, Western Coalfields Ltd, Coal Estates, Civil Lines, Nagpur (Mahrastra)
4. Chief Managing Director South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Dr. R. S. Jha Director Personnel, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
6. Dr. A. M. Ganjre Chief Of Medical Services South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
7. Sanjiv Kumar General Manager (P&A) South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
8. Shri Deepak Kumar Deputy General Manager (P/EE) South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
9. Shivendra Singh Assistant Manager, EE Dept. South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners. : Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Advocate.
For Respondent No. : Dr. N. K. Shukla, Sr. Advocate with Vivek Chopra, Advocate.

Order On Board

28/07/2015

Heard.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner aggrieved by rejection of petitioner's application for initiating proceeding against the respondents officials in the alleged commission of Human Rights violation.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though, the petitioner was not keeping good health, he was suffering from diabetes and hypertension, he was burdened with the officials work which, affected his health. He applied for compulsory retirement but the said application was also not considered and rejected.
3. The alleged ground urged as also reflected from petitioner's complaint, prima facie shows that it is not a case of Human Rights violations as such. If the petitioner had any grievance, he could have taken remedy against the rejection of application. In fact, the petitioner does not dispute that he had taken legal remedy of filing a petition before the High Court Nagpur. Only because the petitioner was burdened with work and he was suffering from diabetes and hypertension, it can not be said to be a case of Human Rights violation.
4. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Judge

Amita