
(2022) 09 CHH CK 0053
In the Chhattisgarh High Court
Case No : Writ Petition (S) No. 4880 Of 2022

Union Of India

APPELLANT

Vs

Gourav Yadav

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 22-09-2022

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2022) 09 CHH CK 0053

Hon'ble Judges : Arup Kumar Goswami, CJ;Deepak Kumar Tiwari, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Ramakant Mishra

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. Heard Mr. Ramakant Mishra, learned Assistant Solicitor General for the petitioners.
2. This petition is presented against an order dated 14.03.2022 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur Bench, Circuit Sitting at Bilaspur (for short, 'CAT') in Original Application No.200/970/2021, by which the CAT directed the respondents to consider the case of the applicant before the CAT for appointment within a period of three months.
3. The applicant before the CAT is grandson of ancestor, whose land is acquired for the purpose of extension of broad-gauge railway lines from Gondia to Jabalpur. The respondents had a policy for giving appointment to sole owner of land or son/daughter/husband/wife of the sole owner, whose land or a portion thereof was acquired for the project.
4. The learned CAT relied on its earlier judgment in case of Yashvant Kumar v. Union of India (Original Application No. 203/929/2014), decided on 28.11.2017, which was affirmed by the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition (S) No. 1349 of 2018 (South Eastern Central Railway and Others v. Yashvant and Others), decided on 03.04.2018, and accordingly, issued the directions as noted

hereinabove.

5. It is pointed by Mr. Mishra that against the judgment of this Court dated 03.04.2018 passed in Writ Petition (S) No. 1349 of 2018, a Special Leave Petition was filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which is pending consideration.

6. As the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition (S) No. 1349 of 2018 had held that a grandson was entitled to be appointed on rehabilitation ground due to extension of railway route, we see no good ground to interfere with the order of the learned CAT.

7. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. No cost.