

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 5401 of 2021**

Smt. Anandi Bai D/o Late Shri Ratan Lal, Aged About 40 Years R/o Khursiabandhapara, Post Pondi Uproda, Tahsil Pondi Uproda District Korba (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Energy And Power, Mantralaya, Raipur, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Collector, Korba, District Korba Chhattisgarh
3. The General Manager, C.G. State Power Generation Co. Ltd., (A Government Of Chhattisgarh Undertaking), Raipur, Vidyut Sewa Bhawan, Danganiya, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh) 492013
4. The Deputy General Manager, C.G. State Power Generation Co. Ltd., (A Government Of Chhattisgarh Undertaking), Raipur, Vidyut Sewa Bhawan, Dangania, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh. 492013
5. The Chief Engineer (Hr) Chhattisgarh State Power Generation Co. Ltd., Shed No. 03, Dangania, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. The Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Katghora, Korba, District Korba Chhattisgarh
7. Ram Diyal S/o Avadh Ram, R/o Dodkadhari, Post Office Gupalpur, District Korba Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Smt. Binu Sharma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****06/10/2021**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition seems to be the decision on the part of the respondents No. 3 to 5 in calling upon the respondent No.7 for employment against the land belonging to one Ratan Lal i.e. the father of the petitioner.
2. The contention of the petitioner is that the respondent No.7 has fraudulently obtained a document said to be the adoption deed on the

basis of which he is trying to claim the benefit flowing from the land which belongs to the father of the petitioner, which stood acquired including the benefit of employment in lieu of acquisition of land.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the original owner of the land late Ratan Lal i.e. the father of the petitioner himself had appraised the respondents by way of an objection during his lifetime, which is pending consideration before the respondents. In addition, the petitioner being the daughter of the original land owner Ratan Lal had also made a representation and filed objection before the respondents No. 3 to 5 in this regard, but all of which are still pending consideration. Meanwhile, the respondents have called upon the respondent No.7 for medical examination for the purpose of grant of employment.
4. Given the fact that the matter pertains to a dispute in respect of the genuinity of the respondent No.7, so far as being adopted son of late Ratan Lal, this Court is of the opinion that such disputed questions of fact are not one, which can be decided by the Writ Court. For proper adjudication of the said dispute necessary evidence would also have to be recorded and for which the petitioner would have to approach the concerned Civil Court in this regard. Meanwhile, however the present writ petition in its present form stands disposed of directing the respondents No.3 to 5 to take appropriate decision only after considering the objection and representation that the petitioner has made including the objection and representation which the original land owner i.e. late Ratan Lal had submitted before the Department in respect of the alleged fraudulent claim being made by the respondent No.7.

5. Subject to the outcome of the said decision of the respondents, the petitioner would be at liberty to approach the concerned Civil Court for ventilating her further grievances, if any.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved