

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P (C) No. 26030 of 2022

Bipin Pangi

.....

Petitioner

Mr. Malaya Kumar Mishra, Advocate

Vs.

***National Aluminium Company
Ltd., Koraput & Others***

.....

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE B.R. SARANGI

MR. JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

04.11.2022

Order No.

01.

This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Heard. Mr. Malaya Kumar Mishra, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner.

3. The Petitioner has filed this Writ Petition to quash the order dated 08.10.2021 under Annexure-5 rejecting the prayer of the petitioner to include his name in the list of Substantially Affected Person (SAP).

4. Mr. M.K. Mishra, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contended that the land of the petitioner's father had been acquired by the opp. parties for the purpose of NALCO, but the name of the petitioner was not included in the list of Substantially Affected Person (SAP) by the authority. Therefore, he had earlier approached this Court by filing W.P.(C) No.825 of 2021, which was disposed of vide order dated 04.02.2021 with a direction to the Collector, Koraput to verify the claim of the petitioner by disposing of his representation dated 16.12.2020.

5. In compliance of the order passed by this Court, the Collector verified the claim of the petitioner and came to a finding that the property of the petitioner's grandfather was acquired, so also the property of his father. For acquisition of land of the petitioner's father and grandfather, R&R benefit was extended and one of the members of the petitioner's family, namely, Nakula Pangi, nominated by Kamalu Pangi was given regular employment and residential house at Aanlabadi Rehabilitation Colony. As the benefit had already been extended, the representation of the petitioner was rejected by the Collector by holding that the petitioner is not coming under SAP category of NALCO, Damanjodi

6. In such view of the matter, we do not find any illegality or irregularity in the order dated 08.10.2021 passed by the Collector, Koraput so as to cause interference with the same.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition merits no consideration and the same is hereby dismissed.

(DR. B.R. SARANGI)
JUDGE

sangita

(B. P. SATAPATHY)
JUDGE