

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WRIT PETITION (S) NO.6599 OF 2018**

Jagat Singh S/o Late Shri Ghasiram Aged About 59 Years Mechanical Fitter Nouz No. 24275059 Kurja Colliery Hasdev Area S.E.C.L., R/o Kapildhara, Colony House No. M.Q./63, Post Bijuri, District- Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh., District : Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh.

**...Petitioner(s)****Versus**

1. Union of India Through The Secretary Coal Minister Of India, Coal India Limited 5th Floor Laxmi Nagar, District- Centre New Delhi., District : New Delhi, Delhi
2. Chief Managing Director South Eastern Coalfield Limited Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Director (Personnel) Appellate Officer South Eastern Coalfield Limited, Head Office Bilaspur, Office Of The Head Office S.E.C.L. Bilaspur, Tahsil And District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. Deputy General Manager (M) Sub Area Manager Kunja, Sub Area, Hasdev Area, Post Bijuri, District- Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh., District : Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh
5. Senior Manager Mining Manager Kunja, U.G. Mine, Sub Area Manager Kunja, Sub Area, Hasdev Area Post Bijuri, District- Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh., District : Anuppur, Madhya Pradesh

**... Respondent(s)**

|                        |   |                                  |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For Petitioner         | : | Shri Vijay K Deshmukh, Advocate. |
| For Respondents 2 to 5 | : | Shri Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate.   |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy****Order on Board****05.10.2018**

1. The Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate, present in the court is directed to accept notice on behalf of respondents No.2 to 5 and with the consent of the parties, the matter is heard finally.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that inadvertently in the cause title, the status of the respondent No.3 has been wrongly mentioned as Director (Labour) whereas, it should have been Director (Personnel) and therefore prays for permitting him to make necessary corrections.
3. The said prayer is not opposed. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to make necessary corrections during the course of day itself.

4. The petitioner has challenged the order of termination by moving appropriate appeal before the respondent No.3 vide Annexure P/7. The appeal was filed as early as on May, 2018, but till date no decision has been taken by the appellate authority and therefore prays for early decision of the appeal.
5. The said prayer is not opposed by the respondents.
6. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.3 to decide the pending appeal of the petitioner, if not decided till date, within a further period of 60 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.
7. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to apprise the respondent No.3 so far as order passed by this court is concerned.

Sd/-  
(P. Sam Koshy  
**Judge**