

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2920 of 2017**

1. Ramu S/o Sukhram Aged About 23 Years R/o Village Karampur, Post Office Kumda Colliery, Tehsil Surajpur, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
 2. Sukhram S/o Pardesiya Aged About 65 Years R/o Village Karampur, Post Office Kumda Colliery, Tehsil Surajpur, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
- Petitioners**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Industries/revenue, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Revenue And Civil District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
 2. Collector, Surajpur (Earlier Surguja), Revenue And Civil District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
 3. S D O (Revenue), Surajpur, Revenue And Civil District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
 4. Tehsildar, Surajpur, Revenue And Civil District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
 5. South Eastern Coalfields Limited Through Chief General Manager, Bishrampur, Revenue And Civil District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
 6. Regional Personnel Manager, S. E. C. L. Bishrampur Area, Post Bishrampur, Revenue And Civil District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
- Respondents**

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Surfaraj Khan, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent-SECL	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Shukla, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****10/10/2017**

Heard.

1. Though return has not been filed, in view of order passed by this Court earlier in batch of petitions, learned counsel for the petitioners prays, not opposed by learned counsel for the respondents, that the matter itself may be disposed off with the direction for consideration and appropriate decision,

accordingly, following order is passed :

2. This is the case filed by the petitioners who are 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 petitioners' 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 applicants so that they may also know the reason for rejection of their claim.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge