

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition No.4927 of 2005**

1. Rameshwar Singh, aged about 62 years, S/o late Shri S.N. Singh Personnel No.02355, Dy. Manager, HSCL Bhilai, District Durg (CG).
2. Nagendra Kumar Verma, aged about 57 years, S/o late Shri R.P. Verma, Personnel No.40075, AEO HSCL Bhilai, District Durg (CG).
3. G.P. Mishra, aged about 59 years, S/o late Shri R.K. Mishra, Personnel No.45042, Sr. HSCL Bhilai, District Durg (CG).
4. S.K.Shrivastava, aged about 55 years, S/o late Shri B.L. Shrivastava, Personnel No.43267, S.O.HSCL Bhilai, District Durg (CG).
5. V.K. Palia, aged about 53 years, S/o late Shri P.L. Palia, Personnel No.01468, Sr. Manager, HSCL Vizag, R/o Samrath Sadan, Bengali Para Laxmi Nagar Near Pach Peri Naka Chowk, Raipur, District Raipur (CG).
6. P.L. Patwa, aged about 59 years, S/o late Shri G.P. Patwa, Personnel No.01165, Sr. Manager (C), R/o Junior MIG 120, Sector IV, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur (CG).
7. R.N.Sharma, aged about 53 years, S/o Shri G.P. Sharma, Dy. Manager Personnel No.2222348 (BH), HSCL Bhilai, District Durg (CG).
8. Mahanga Singh, aged about 54 years, S/o Shri Sundar Bhagat Singh, Personnel No.67049 Welder cum Gas Cutter, HSCL Bhilai R/o 4D/15/7 Bhilai District Durg (CG).

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. Hindustan Steel Works Construction Ltd. through its Chairman cum Managing Director (HSCL), 5A Commercial Street, Hastings Kolkata.
2. Hindustan Steel Works Construction Ltd. through General Manager, Bhilai (HSCL), Post Bhilai, District Durg (CG).

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Ms. Kiran Singh, Advocate
 For Respondents : Mr. Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order On Board

01/11/2017

(1) At the outset, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners' case is covered by the judgment rendered by this Court in Writ Appeal No.185 of 2007 (Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd. & another Vs. Smt Kiran Sahu & Others) decided on 03.02.2015 and, therefore, in light of above judgment, he may be permitted to make representation before the competent authority and the same may be directed to be decided within the specific time frame.

(2) Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit, on instructions, that all the dues have already been paid to the petitioners as per details mentioned in Annexure R/2.

(3) Be that as it may, if the petitioners file representation before the competent authority for redressal of their grievances, it is expected from the authority concerned to decide the same in the light of judgment of this Court in W.A. No.185/2007 (decided on 03.02.2005) in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of representation.

(4) With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

L/-