

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CONT No. 74 of 2017**

Ku. Babita Adile D/o Late Jaitram, Aged About 29 Years R/o Village
Ralia, Tahsil Katghora, Post Mudhali, District Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

D. Shrinath Chief General Manager South Eastern Coaldfields Ltd.
Gavera Area, Korba, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
(Contemnor) **---- Respondent**

For Petitioner : Shri Sanjay Kumar Agrawal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****09/02/2017**

Heard.

1. This contempt petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging willful disobedience of the directions issued by this Court in petitioner's case and another connected case vide order dated 15.07.2016.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this Court had directed the respondents to examine petitioner's claim for grant of employment in lieu of acquisition of land as per the order passed by this Court on 23.07.2015 in the case of **Ku. Rattho Bai and Anr. Vs. South Eastern Coalfields Limited and Ors. in WPS No.432 of 2011**. It is submitted that the spirit of the order was that while considering the claim for employment of land oustees, policy of the State Government should be taken into consideration but while deciding the matter, the authority has distinguished the case from that of **Ku. Rattho Bai (supra)** decided case of the petitioner relying upon the policy of the State of Chhattisgarh as also policy of SECL/Coal India Limited which amounts to willful disobedience.
3. After having gone through, by which, the petitioner's claim has been

rejected. I find that the authority has considered the claim of the petitioner on its own understanding of the order of the Court and has recorded reasons why he did not find the case of the petitioner similar to that of **Ku. Rattho Bai (supra)**.

4. Irrespective of whether the decision is correct in understanding and perspective of the earlier order, I do not find the authority had any intention of flouting the order of the Court. It is different thing to say that the order does not correctly decide the issue and another thing to say that it is a case of willful disobedience.

5. Therefore, I find that it is not a case of initiating contempt proceeding. The petition is, therefore, dismissed. However, with liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order, by which, claim has been rejected in dependent proceedings.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge