

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 1370 of 2016

1. Smt. Kaushilya Bai Wd/o Late Awadh Ram Chauhan, Aged About 60 Years R/o. Village Laat, P.S. Chhal, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, Distt. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. South Eastern Coalfields Limited Through The Chairman Cum Managing Director, HQ, Seepat Road, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Sub Area Manager, S E C L, Sub Area Chhal, Area Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Collector, Distt. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
4. Tahsil Ram, S/o Late Shri Thanda Ram Aged About 50 Years R/o. Village Laat, P.S. Chhal, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, Distt. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
5. Kartikeshwar Chauhan, S/o Shri Tahsil Ram, Aged About 25 Years R/o. Village Laat, P.S. Chhal, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, Distt. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	Ms. Madhunisha Singh, Advocate
For Respondent No.1&2	Shri Vivek Chopda, Advocate
For Respondent No.3	Shri Rajendra Tripathi, PL
For Respondent No.4&5	None

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

17/03/2017

1. The matter pertains to claim for rehabilitation in form of employment in lieu of acquisition of land belonging to the petitioner's family. There is a dispute between the petitioner and the respondents No.4 & 5 about such entitlement.
2. Ms. Madhu Nisha Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, would submit that the representation was earlier preferred before the Collector and the Officers of the SECL, which is yet to be decided.
3. Shri Vivek Chopda, learned counsel for the respondent SECL, would submit that the competent authority for deciding such dispute about the conflicting claim for seeking employment in lieu of acquisition of land is the concerned Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue), however, the petitioner has not preferred any representation before the said authority and further that the respondent No.5 has already been offered employment.
4. In view of the statement made by Shri Vivek Chopda, learned counsel for the respondent SECL, Ms. Madhu Nisha Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, seeks permission of the Court to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to move a representation before the concerned SDO (R).

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn with the liberty as stated *supra*. If such representation is moved, the SDO (R) shall consider and decide the same by a speaking order, in accordance with law and on its own merits, as early as possible preferably within a period of three months, from the of receipt of representation.

Sd/-

Judge

Prashant Kumar Mishra

Gowri