

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPC No.2866 of 2018**

- Navin Kumar Sahu S/o Late Shri Maniram Sahu Aged About 60 Years R/o Village Bijari, Post Porda, Tahsil Gharghoda, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. Union Of India Through Secretary, Ministry Of Coal, Delhi (India)
2. South Eastern Coalfields Limited Through Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief General Manager, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Raigarh Area, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
4. Collector, Raigarh, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue), Raigarh, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondents**


---

|                      |                             |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | Shri R. S. Patel, Advocate  |
| For Respondent-State | Shri Shashank Thakur, GA    |
| For Respondent-SECL  | Shri Vivek Chopda, Advocate |

---

**Hon'ble Justice Mr. Prashant Kumar Mishra****Order On Board****22/10/2018**

1. There is no dispute that the petitioner's lands have been acquired for the benefit of SECL under the provisions of the Coal Bearing Area (Acquisition & Development) Act, 1957 (for short 'the Act'). The dispute which subsists between the parties is in respect of

adequacy of compensation and the interest payable on the amount of compensation. The second contest between the parties is about application of rehabilitation policy from the date on which the land was acquired or under the new policy which came into effect in the year 2012.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the issue concerning applicability of Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy is governed by the order passed by this Court in the matter of **Ku. Rattho Bai & Another Vs. South Eastern Coalfields Limited & Others** {(WPS No.432/2011, decided on 23.7.2015}, while the same is disputed by the respondents.
3. Insofar as the issue concerning adequacy of compensation and payment of interest is concerned, the petitioner has remedy of moving before the Tribunal constituted under Section 14 of the Act.
4. Let the petitioner move before the Tribunal within a period of one month from today. On such application for grant of adequate compensation, the claim of the petitioner shall be decided on merits without raising plea of limitation.
5. For other relief in respect of applicability of rehabilitation policy and grant of employment under the said policy to a member of the petitioner's family or his dependents, the petitioner may move fresh representation before the respondent/SECL within a period of one month, who in turn, shall decide the same, in accordance with law within a period of 3 months thereafter. The

representation shall be decided by a reasoned order expressly dealing with the issue as to whether the order passed by this Court in **Ku. Rattho Bai** (referred to above) is applicable or not.

6. The writ petition stands disposed of in the above stated terms.

Sd/-

Prashant Kumar Mishra  
Judge

Nirala