



2026:CGHC:18227



2026:CGHC:18227

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### WPS No. 1412 of 2024

Sangram Singh Rajput Son Of Shri Surendra Singh Rajput Aged About 34 Years Resident Of Village Janji Presently Resident Of House No. D-6, C.K. Awas, Ashok Nagar, P.S. Sarkanda, Sipat Road, Dist.- Bilaspur, C.G.

... **Petitioner**

### **versus**

National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd. Through Sr. Manager (H.R.)  
National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd. Sipat Super Thermal Power Station,  
Post Office Ujjawal Nagar, Sipat, P.S. Sipat, Dist. Bilaspur, C.G.

... **Respondent**

|                |   |                                                                                |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate assisted by<br>Mr. Vinod Kumar Sharma, Advocate |
| For Respondent | : | Mr. Anuroop Panda, Advocate                                                    |

**S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge**

### **Order on Board**

**21.04.2026**

Heard

- Petitioner has filed this writ petition, seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner and pass appropriate order for appointment as per similarly situated candidate have granted appointment, in the interest of justice.

10.2 Any other relief which may be suitable in the facts and circumstances of the case, may also be granted.”



2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the land owned by petitioner is recorded in the name of father of petitioner, measuring 2.60 acres situated at Village Janji, Patwari Halka No. 24. The said land was acquired by respondent, but respondent failed to provide employment to one of the family members in lieu of the land acquired. He submits that petitioner has submitted representation before the authorities which till date is also not considered and decided.
3. Learned counsel for respondent submits that petitioner has earlier filed a writ petition seeking similar relief bearing WPS No. 1215 of 2016 which was dismissed on merits vide order dated 26.08.2016, and therefore, the second writ petition filed by petitioner, on same ground and on same cause of action is not maintainable. He also referred to copy of order dated 26.08.2016 in writ petition bearing WPS No. 1215 of 2016 filed as Annexure P-4 in his submission.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the respective parties.
5. Perusal of the documents would show that it is the petitioner who enclosed along with the writ petition copy of the order dated 26.08.2016 passed in WPS No. 1215 of 2016 vide Annexure P-4 wherein the petitioner has sought for relief of grant of employment under the rehabilitation scheme framed by respondent. The writ petition was dismissed on merits and the operative portion of the said order is extracted below for ready reference:-

“1. Short question which arises in this Writ Petition is- whether the petitioner is entitled to grant of employment under the rehabilitation scheme framed by the NTPC. It is not disputed that clause 2.6.2 of the rehabilitation scheme reads as follows:-



“As per RAP Clause 2.6.2: “All persons (Khatedars) whose land is being acquired for the project and fulfill the above mentioned eligibility criteria but are employed in any Govt./semigovt./public sector department etc. on a permanent post shall not be eligible to receive the rehabilitation benefits. However, such persons (Khatedars) whose land is being acquired for the project and fulfill the above mentioned criteria, and are employed in any Govt./semigovt./public sector department etc on a permanent post, shall be entitled to receive the rehabilitation benefits provided that they have been residing in any of the eight affected villages from where land is being acquired for the project since at least five years prior to date of publication of Sec. 4 (1) notification under the land Acquisition Act, 1894, i.e. five years prior to 06.11.1998.”

7.The execution which has been carved out is that those who are government servants but are residing in any of the eight villages for a period of five years immediately prior to 06.11.1998 would be entitled to benefit of the rehabilitation scheme. While framing rehabilitation scheme, it was felt that the persons who must be cultivating the land and reaping other benefits would get benefit of rehabilitation. There is a reasonable classification between those who were actually residing and those who may have domicile in the village but not actually residing in the village.”

6. When the question was imposed upon the learned counsel for petitioner that as to how this writ petition is maintainable he contended that after the first writ petition came to be dismissed he filed this writ petition on new grounds which came to the knowledge of petitioner after dismissal of the first writ petition.
7. Be that as it may. The facts remains that first writ petition filed by petitioner seeking similar relief against the land recorded in the name of petitioner's father came to be dismissed, therefore, the second writ



petition for the same relief would not be maintainable as it is already dismissed and if, it is the submission of counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is having another ground, then petitioner has some other remedy to redress his grievance and not the second writ petition.

8. Accordingly, the present writ petition being devoid of merits is **dismissed**. No order as to cost(s).

Certified copy as per rules.

sd/-

**(Parth Prateem Sahu)**  
Judge

Alfiza