

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2544 of 2020

Prateek Singh, S/o Shri Natwar Dayal Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Tendubhatha, Post Sarkho, Tahsil Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Power Holding Company Limited Through Its Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, CSPDCL Dagania, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Engineer (Production) Atal Bihari Bajpai Tap Vidyut Grih Madwa, Tendubhatha, Post Vidyut Nagar (Lachhanpur) District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh
3. The Superintending Engineer, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Production Company Limited, Madwa, Tendubhatha, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh
4. The Executive Director, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Production Company Limited, Madwa, Tendubhatha, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh
5. The Collector, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. K.P. Sahu, Advocate
----------------	---	-------------------------

For State	:	Ms. Akanksha Jain, Dy. Govt. Advocate
-----------	---	---------------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

ORDER

02.07.2020

1. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the petitioner's land though was acquired by the respondents for setting up a Power Plant but as per the award, the family members have not been given the employment. He would submit that the petitioner belong to family of Natwar Dayal Singh and though the lands of Natwar Dayal Singh &

Hardayal Singh were recorded in joint ownership but actually they were living separate having independent entity for their livelihood including the cultivation of their land. He would further submit that son of Hardayal Singh namely Sanjeev Kumar Singh whose land was also separate was given the employment; however, in respect of petitioner who is descendant of Natwar Dayal Singh has not been given the employment. Learned counsel submits that under the circumstances, to ascertain the facts and grievance, the petitioner be given liberty to make a representation so that the case of the petitioner can be considered by the respondents.

2. Considering the limited prayer made by the petitioner, as the petitioner during the course of submission made an overlapping submission which appears to be appreciated by the respondents on its own fact, the petitioner is given liberty to make a representation to the respondent No.2 within a period of 3 weeks along with all the relevant documents. The said representation, if so filed, shall be decided within a further period of 6 months from the date of representation.
3. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge