

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2798 of 2018

=====

Bhuneshwar Prasad Verma S/o late Rameswar Prasad Verma Executive
director Works, steel authority of India Limited , Rourkela Steel Plant Under
suspension Presently Headquarter at Durgapur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Steel Authority Of India Limited Through Its Chairman
2. Chairman, Steel Authority of India Limited Corporate Office Ispat Bhawan,
Lodi Road, New Delhi- 1100
3. The Director personal, Steel Authority of India Limited Corporate Office
Ispat Bhawan, Lodi Road,
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Steel Authority of India Limited, Rourkela,
Steel Plant, Orissa.
5. The Deputy General Manager Personal, Steel Authority of India Limited
Corporate Office Ispat Bhawan

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Jayant Kumar Karn, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 26-09-2019

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Shri
Karn for Steel Authority of India.

The challenge raised is to a suspension order dated
10th January, 2017. This challenge raised before the Tribunal
failed. Hence, this writ petition.

The contention raised is that the undue delay and



prolongment of the suspension order was unjustified and unreasonable. The Tribunal came to the conclusion that in the background of the case and keeping in view the Rules and Regulations applicable, it declined to interfere with the suspension order, but made an observation that it would be desirable for the respondent authorities to review the continuance or otherwise of the suspension order.

During the period of the pendency of this writ petition, the respondent Steel Authority has filed a counter affidavit and Annexure-F thereto brings on record the communication of the General Manager dt. 10.7.2019 indicating that the suspension order had been reviewed by the competent authority. It was not found appropriate to revoke the suspension order.

The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the said suspension order does not contain any valid or cogent reason or even consideration of the undue prolonging of the suspension order and, therefore, the same should be interfered with.

We are of the considered opinion that the contention raised can be challenged before the Tribunal by impugning the order dated 10th July, 2019 and, therefore, the



petition is consigned to record, without prejudice to the rights of
the petitioner to challenge the said order in accordance with law.

(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

K.C.Jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	30.09.2019
Transmission Date	N/A

