

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WA No. 794 of 2018**

H. R. Yadav S/o Late Roopchand Yadav, Aged About 68 Years Retired H.S.C.L.
Employee, Bhilai Unit, R/o Radhika Nagar, Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. Union Of India Through The Steel Ministry, New Delhi
2. The General Manager, Hindustan Steelworks Construction Limited, Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh
3. The Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, Hindustan Steelworks Construction Limited, Reg. Office P-34, Gariya Hat Road (South) Kolkata 700031

---- Respondents

For Appellant : In person.

For Respondent/UOI : Shri B. Gopa Kumar, Assistant Solicitor General.

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge****Judgment on Board****05/12/2018****Per Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**

1. Heard Appellant in person and perused the impugned order dated 23.10.2018 passed by the learned Single Judge.
2. This is not a first round of litigation, but repeated litigations for the sake of litigation. Accounting has been done and outstanding dues have been calculated, it fails to satisfy him. If the erstwhile employee only to hang on to the official accommodation keeps agitating imaginary claims and dues on a notion, then writ Court cannot reach beyond the adjudication already made and reflected in para-8 of the order impugned, which reads as under:-

“8. It appears from the records that the petitioner was held entitled to ₹2,24,377/-, which is apparent from the order dated 10.4.2017 (Annexure R/8), but since the petitioner has not vacated the house allotted to him though he had already retired from service on 31.7.2003 despite there being observation by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the order of the Estate Officer for which huge amount of

₹2,47,560/- and ₹14,359/- has been deducted and thereafter amount of ₹37,542/- has been found outstanding against him. The petitioner ought to have questioned the order dated 10.4.2017 (Annexure R/8) passed by the respondent-HSCL deciding the dispute raised by the petitioner, which he did not question and straightway filed this writ petition claiming unpaid dues of ₹16,02,511.36, in which in the considered opinion of this Court, there is no material to grant such an amount to the petitioner. The order dated 10.4.2017 passed by the respondent-HSCL has become final as it has not been questioned by the petitioner and the respondent-HSCL has clearly stated in its counter-affidavit that no additional amount claimed by the petitioner in this writ petition is due.”

3. The appeal has no merit. It is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE