

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**  
**WPS No. 6610 of 2016**

Yogesh Kumar Mishra, son of late Gorelal Mishra, aged about 24 years, resident of Bahanpath, Police Station Hardi Bazar, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba (CG).

---- Petitioner

**Versus**

1. South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. Through the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Seepat Road, Bilaspur (CG).
2. Chief General Manager, South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. Gavera Area, Korba, Distt.Korba (CG).
3. Staff Officer (Land Revenue) South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. Gavera Area, Korba, Distt.Korba (CG).
4. Collector, Korba, Distt.Korba (CG)

---- Respondents

|                   |   |                                |
|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For Petitioner    | : | Mr. Rahul K. Mishra, Advocate  |
| For Res.No.1 to 3 | : | Mr.V.R. Tiwari, Advocate       |
| For Res.No.4      | : | Ms. Astha Shukla, Panel Lawyer |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**

**Order On Board**

**13/12/2016**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the parties would submit that the matter is covered by the decision of this Court passed in **WPS No.4982 of 2016 (Mukesh Kumar Patel vs. South Eastern Coalfields Ltd. and others)**, decided on 22.9.2016 by which in paragraph 4 and 5 this Court has held as under:-

“4. In view of aforesaid submission and order passed by this Court on 23/07/2015 in Ku.Rattho Bai (supra), at this stage, it would be proper to dispose off this matter with a

direction to respondent no.2 to examine the claim of the petitioners in the light of order dated 23/07/2015 passed in the case of Ku.Rattho Bai (supra). If upon verification of facts, the petitioners herein are found to be identically situated, their case shall also be considered for grant of employment as per the policy of rehabilitation.

5. Considering that the matter relates to rehabilitation policy of land oustees, respondent No.2 is expected to take decision on the claim of the respective petitioners within a period of 20 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

2. In view of above, the writ petition is disposed of in terms of paragraph 4 and 5 of the decision rendered by this Court in the case of **Mukesh Kumar Patel** (supra). No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

**(Sanjay K. Agrawal)**  
**Judge**

L/-