

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 3884 of 2017**

Kanhaiya Sahu S/o Shri Baliram Sahu, Aged About 21 Years R/o
Village Laat, Tehsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. South Eastern Coalfield Limited Through Its Chairman, Cum Managing Director, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
2. Managing Director, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raigarh Area, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
3. Regional Personnel Manger, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raigarh Area, Behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Post Box No. 27 District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
4. Staff Officer (Land Revenue) South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raigarh Area, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Amit Chaki, Advocate
For Respondents/SECL	:	Mr. Vikram Sharma with Mr. Shailendra Shukla, Advocates

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

22/08/2017

This is the case filed by the petitioner who is claiming employment under the rehabilitation policy framed by the Government and respondent / SECL from time to time with an object to provide proper rehabilitation in addition to proper compensation in lieu of land acquisition.

Though applications have been made and claims have been raised, decisions on these applications have not been taken.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondent / SECL in this matter submits that whatever applications are filed seeking employment by those whose lands have been acquired, matters are referred to the head quarter and there is a committee of officials which considers those applications in the light of the applicable rehabilitation policy.

In view of the statement which has now been made before this Court by learned counsel for the respondent / SECL, this petition is disposed off at this stage with a direction to the respondents to examine the petitioner's case on its own merits upon due application of mind and take decision expeditiously. It would be in fitness to direct the respondents that where such application is pending for employment in lieu of land acquisition, it should be decided within an outer limit of six months. In order to maintain transparency in the decision making process and to disclose mind and reason why in a given case, appointment was refused, is expected that some brief reasons are recorded in the minutes of the meeting and supplied to the applicant so that he may also know the reason for rejection of his claim.

**Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge**