



2026:CGHC:3527



2026:CGHC:3527

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 266 of 2026

1 - Sonu Bharti W/o Arvind Banjare, Aged About 29 Years Caste Satnami, R/o Village Hardi Bazar, Tehsil, District Korba (C.G.)

... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Through Chairman-Cum-Managing Director, Head Office, Basant Vihar, Seepat Road, Bilaspur District Bilaspur (C.G.)

2 - Chief General Manager, S.E.C.L., M Dipka Area District Korba (C.G.)

3 - General Manager, South Eastern Coalfields Limited Dipka, Area, District Korba C.G.

4 - Staff Officer (Land Revenue), South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Dipka Area, District Korba (C.G.)

5 - The Collector, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)

... **Respondents**

(Cause title, as taken from CIS system)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Santosh Yadu, Advocate
For SECL/Respondents No.1 to 4	:	Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate
For State/Respondent No.5	:	Dr. Arham Siddiqui, Panel Lawyer.

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

21/01/2026

1. Heard.

2. This petition has been preferred by petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking following reliefs:-



“10.1 That, the Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to provide the employment/service to the petitioner instead of the land acquired in Dipka Project.

10.2 That, the Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief, as it may deems fit and appropriate.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner’s mother is a land oustee. Her land bearing Khasra No.262/3, area 0.10 hectare and 0.40 hectare, situated at Village Hardi Bazar, P.H.N. 15, Tehsil Hardi Bazar has been acquired by respondents-SECL. Though the compensation has been determined but the petitioner and her mother are not interested to get compensation, rather, they wanted employment in lieu of acquirement. He next submits that the petitioner has filed representation (Annexure-P/4) dated 08.04.2024 before the Collector, District Korba and copy of the same has also been given to authority of SECL but the same has not been decided till date. He lastly submits that the petitioner is ready to file a fresh representation before the respondent No.3, hence, he prays that this petition may be disposed of directing respondent No.3 to decide the same in accordance with law/policy/guidelines within stipulated period.
4. On this, learned counsel appearing for the respondents No.1 to 4- SECL submits that if the petitioner files a representation, it shall be decided in accordance with law.
5. Having considered the limited prayer of petitioner and contentions made by learned counsel for the parties, this petition is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation before the respondent No.3 for redressal of her grievance, within a period of 30 days from today along with all necessary documents and a copy of this



order. Thereafter, if such representation is filed by the petitioner, it shall be considered and decided by respondent No.3 in accordance with law/policy/guideline, within further period of 60 days from the date of receipt of representation filed by the petitioner.

6. With aforesaid observations and directions, this writ petition stands **disposed of**.
7. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge