

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition No. 1081 of 2002**

- J.S. Ahluwalia, Aged about 62 years, S/o Shri Darbara Singh, Ex Assistant Engineer, M.P. Electricity Board, Bilaspur, Now Resident of 27 Kholi, Indrasen Nagar, Mangla P.O. & District Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Through Secretary, Danganiya, P.O. & District Raipur (C.G.)
2. Chief General Manager, M.P. Power Management Co. Ltd. Shakti Bhawan, Vidyut Nagar, Rampur, Jabalpur (M.P.)
3. General Manager (HR), CSPDCL, Danganiya, Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. H.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1	:	Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, Advocate.
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****04/05/18**

1. The petitioner has challenged the order dated 11-06-1999 (Annexure P-3) by which Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board has imposed penalty of Rs.1,48,681/- upon the petitioner.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the impugned order is unsustainable and bad in law.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents has brought to the notice that against the order dated 11-06-1999, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority and the said authority has dismissed the

appeal on 17-12-1999 and that order has not been challenged and as such the same has attained finality.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with utmost circumspection.

5. Against the order dated 11-06-1999, the petitioner has preferred an appeal which was dismissed by the Board and the same has not been challenged, as such it has attained finality and no relief can be granted to the petitioner. Regarding other relevant claims, the petitioner's application has been considered on 25-06-1996 which has also not been challenged and that has also attained finality.

6. Lastly, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner retired on 31-01-1998 but his retiral dues have been paid with delay, therefore, he is entitled for interest.

7. Be that as it may, if the petitioner files a representation before respondent No.3 – CSPDCL claiming interest, it shall be considered and decided by the said authority strictly in accordance with law within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. The writ petition is disposed of in above terms. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge