

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3022 of 2016

Prahlad Sahu S/o Late Shri Durjan Sahu, Aged About 46 Years
Pump Operator, Category- 4 At N E I S No. 24653073 Bagdeva
Underground Project, Korba Area, Police Station Katghora, Civil &
Revenue Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. South Eastern Coalfields Limited Head Office At Seepat Road,
Bilaspur, Through Its Chairman- Cum- Managing Director, Distt.
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Chief General Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Limited,
Korba Area, Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Chief Personnel Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Limited,
Korba Area, Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Chief Manager Personnel/ Regional Personnel Manager, S E
C L Korba Area, Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
5. Sub Regional Manager, Dhelwadiah Singhali Bagdeva, Sub Area, S
E C L Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri A.S. Rajput, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Shri Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate, on advance copy

S.B.:Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

20/07/2016

Heard on admission.

1. The grievance of the petitioner is that even though the petitioner had submitted application in prescribed formate for review check up on 14.06.2016 before the Assistant Manager (HR/P) Bagdeva underground Project SECL, the petitioner till date has not been examined by the Apex Medical Board. According to the petitioner, the petitioner having undergone spinal surgery in the

past, has not been fully recovered and is unable to perform under mines duty.

2. According to the petitioner, he has submitted application for review check up by the Apex Medical Board on 14.06.2016. His case is, therefore, liable to be examined by the Apex Medical Board whether the petitioner is fit to undertake mining job. Let the case of the petitioner be examined by the Apex Medical Board on the first available opportunity as and when the Medical Board is convened. Depending upon the medical report, an appropriate decision may be taken in the case of the petitioner by the respondents as to whether he should be continued on surface duty or not.

3. Considering that the period of six months is going to expire on 20.07.2016, it is directed that the respondents shall either continue the petitioner on surface duty, subject to administrative exigency or will grant him such leave as admissible to him under the service Rules.

4. With the aforesaid observations/directions, the petition is disposed off.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge