



CGHC010024662026



2026:CGHC:37968

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 703 of 2026

Jayant Gedekar S/o Shri K.C. Kedekar Aged About 28 Years R/o D-104,
Sai Villas And Apartment, Charoda, Bhilai, District - Durg (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1. Union Of India Through Secretary, Ministry Of Steel, Udyog Bhawan,
Dr. Maulana Azad Road, New Delhi – 110011

2. Chairman And Managing Director (C M D) N M D C Limited (A Govt.
Of India Enterprises), Khanij Bhavan, 10-3-311/ A Castle Hills, Masab
Tank Hyderabad - 500 028

3. Additional General Manager (Hr) N M D C Limited, Khanij Bhavan,
10-3-311/ A Castle Hills, Masab Tank Hyderabad - 500 028

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title taken from CIS)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Veer Verma and Mr. Ankush Borkar, Advocate
For Respondent No. 2 & 3	: Mr. Aniket Verma on behalf of Mr. Jitendra Pali, Advocate

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE BIBHU DATTA GURU)

Order on Board

24.08.2026

1. By the present petition, the petitioner is questioning the impugned
cancellation letter dated 11/12/2025 issued by the respondent
No.3, whereby the candidature of the petitioner for the post of
HEM Operator Grade-III (Trainee)(RS-04) has been cancelled.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner successfully cleared all stages of the recruitment process for the post of HEM Operator Grade-III (Trainee) (RS-04) at NMDC Limited, including Computer Based Test (CBT), Pre-Trade Test Document Verification (DV) and Trade Test, and was provisionally selected, as evidenced by the Pre-Employment Medical Examination Letter dated 03.11.2025. Despite this, his candidature was cancelled at the stage of medical examination on the ground of eligibility pertaining to statutory learner's license under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, which had already been verified and accepted at an earlier stage. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner may be permitted to submit a fresh, comprehensive representation before Respondent No. 3, and the concerned authority may be directed to consider and take a decision on the representation at the earliest, within a specified time frame.
3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 2 and 3 submits that as the petitioner is only making a prayer to submit a representation before respondent No. 3, he is having no objection.
4. On due consideration of submission of counsel for the petitioner, the nature of grievance raised in the writ petition, the writ petition at this stage is disposed off permitting petitioner to submit fresh comprehensive representation along with all supporting documents before respondent No. 3 and in the event such a representation is submitted, the concerned authority shall

consider and take decision on the representation, in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within a further period of three months from the date of receipt of representation.

5. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with aforesaid observations and directions.

SD/-
(BIBHU DATTA GURU)
JUDGE

Jyoti