

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 6501 of 2014**

Jagjeet Singh Badesha S/o Late Kehar Singh Badesha Aged About 64 Years Retired As Project Range Officer From Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. Raipur C.G. R/o D - 433, Taigore Nagar Raipur P.S. Tikra Para Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. Through Its Managing Director Lokesh Plaza Shankar Nagar Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Regional General Manager, Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. B -7, Sector II, Devendra Nagar District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Divisional Manager Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. Antagarh Forest Project Division Bhanupratappur District Kanker, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents**AND****WPS No. 859 of 2012**

Jagjeet Singh Badesha S/o Late Kehar Singh Badesha, Aged About 64 Years Retired As Project Range Officer of Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. Raipur C.G. R/o D - 433, Taigore Nagar Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd., Through Its Managing Director Lokesh Plaza Shankar Nagar Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Regional General Manager, Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. B-7, Sector II, Devendra Nagar District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Divisional Manager, Chhattisgarh State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. Antagarh Forest Project Division Bhanupratappur District Kanker, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Jitendra Nath Nande, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Mr. B.L. Sahu, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board**

15/05/2018

1. The grievance raised in the two writ petitions by the petitioner is that by the impugned order a huge amount of recovery has been made from the retiral dues paid to the petitioner.
2. The counsel for the petitioner submits that against the order of recovery the petitioner has already preferred an appeal and the said appeal is pending before the respondent No.1 for more than 5 years.
3. It is the contention of the counsel for the petitioner that none of these recovery orders have been made following the principles of natural justice in as much as no inquiry was conducted nor an opportunity of hearing was granted to the petitioner, neither any preliminary inquiry was conducted to determine the loss which could be attributed upon the petitioner.
4. Given the aforesaid factual matrix of the case, taking the aforesaid contentions into consideration, it is directed that the respondent No.1 should ensure that the appeal of the petitioner, if it has till date not been decided and is pending consideration, the same should be decided forthwith within a period of 60 days from today.
5. It is expected that the respondent No.1 shall pass a reasoned and speaking order objectively considering all the contentions raised by the petitioner in his appeal.
6. The writ petitions stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge