

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P (C) No. 19241 of 2016

Ranjit Kumar Swain

.....

Petitioner

Mr. D. Dhar, Advocate

Vs.

Union of India and others

.....

Opposite Parties

*Mr. P.K. Parhi, ASGI (O.P.No.1)&
Mr. Manoj Mishra, Sr. Advocate along
with Mr. T. Mishra, Advocate
(O.P. Nos. 2 and 3)*

CORAM:

**DR. JUSTICE B.R. SARANGI
MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO**

ORDER

10.05.2022

Order No.

04.

This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Heard Mr. D. Dhar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner; Mr. P.K. Parhi, learned ASGI appearing for opposite party no.1 and Mr. Manoj Mishra, learned Senior Advocate appearing along with Mr. T. Mishra, learned counsel for opposite parties 2 and 3.
3. The petitioner files this writ petition challenging the order dated 26.09.2016 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Cuttack Bench, Cuttack in O.A. No. 23 of 2016.
4. The claim of the petitioner before the tribunal was for direction to the opposite parties to give him appointment as per his qualification under NALCO Project, Angul. It was contended before the tribunal that the Government of Orissa had acquired the land in the district of Angul for NALCO project in the year 1984, wherein lands of one Brundaban Dehury was also acquired. The notice dated 14.01.1984 reveals that Collector, Angul had issued notice for disbursement of compensation amount of Rs.1,448.23 in favour of the original awardee, Brundaban Dehury, who was directed to be present on 20.02.1985 to

receive the amount. As such, the cause of action for getting employment under NALCO Project had arisen way back in the year 1985. Mr. Dehury did not avail the said opportunity at that point of time and only in 2014 made a delegation in favour of present petitioner, who is his son in-law. Accordingly, the tribunal rejected the claim of the petitioner, since the claim of the petitioner was hopelessly barred by limitation.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after going through the record, this court finds no error apparent on the face of the order of the tribunal, warranting interference by this Court.

7. Therefore, the writ petition merits no consideration and, as such, the same stands dismissed.

(DR. B.R. SARANGI)
JUDGE

Arun/Bichi

(SAVITRI RATHO)
JUDGE