

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 775 of 2016

M/s Asian Limes & Minerals Registered Under M.P. Shops & Establishment Act, 1958, Through Its Sole Proprietor Jubaid Ahamad, S/o Late Shri Gul Ahmad, Aged About 53 Years, Having Its Registered Office At Near Nagina Masjid, Mission Chowk, District Katni (Madhya Pradesh) 483501

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Coal, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. South Eastern Coal Fields Limited, Through Its Chairman-Cum- Managing Director, Seepat Road, P.O. S E C L, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh) 495006
3. General Manager (S & M), S E C L, Seepat Road, P.O. S E C L, District Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh) 495006

---- Respondents

Mr. Shreyas Dubey, Advocate for the petitioner.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

30/03/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Short grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is that after termination of contract, it is not being assailed by the petitioner but the petitioner has claimed refund of a total amount of Rs.3,09,792/- which was deposited by it towards supply of coal which could not materialize due to termination of Fuel Supply Agreement.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that for the present, this Court may direct the respondents to consider their representation dated 03.03.2016.

3. Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3 and submits that if there is any representation pending before the respondents in the matter of claim, which is subject matter of this petition, the respondent authorities would consider the same and take appropriate decision thereon at the earliest.

4. In view of the aforesaid statement, this petition, at this stage is disposed off with a direction to respondents No.2 & 3 to decide the petitioner's pending representation dated 03.03.2016 within an outer limit of 45 days from the date of receipt of copy of the order.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not commented upon the merits of the case.

6. In case, the grievance of the petitioner is not redressed/ fully redressed, it would always be open for the petitioner to take such remedy as may be available to him under the law.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge