

(2025) 01 JH CK 0020

Jharkhand High Court

Case No: L.P.A. No. 276 Of 2020

The Steel Authority of India
Limited

APPELLANT

Vs

Pawan Kumar

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Jan. 7, 2025

Hon'ble Judges: M.S. Ramachandra Rao, CJ; Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J

Bench: Division Ndench

Advocate: Indrajit Sinha, Ankit Vishal, Amitabh Prasad, Ranuak Sahay

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Heard the counsel on behalf of appellants and counsel for the State.

Notices on the respondent nos.1 and 4 were served and the other respondents were served through substituted service. There is no representation on behalf of the respondent nos.1 and 8.

In this appeal, the appellants challenge the order of the learned Single Judge passed on 23.07.2019 in W.P. (S) No.7318 of

2016 directing preference to be given to the respondent nos.1 & 8, if any advertisement is issued in future for recruitment on the ground that they

belong to the displaced families whose land had been acquired for the purpose of the appellants-Company.

Admittedly, the Supreme Court in its order dated 05.03.2008 in Civil Appeal No.1774 of 2008 has opined as under: -

This Court in paragraph 11 of the order dated 05.03.2008 observed as follows: -

¶11. Be that as it may, it is now high time to put an end to the litigation. It is an admitted fact that the project was completed way back in 1966 and even after

more than 40 years of the completion of the project, people whose land was acquired for the purposes of the project are still litigating for getting employment. This

is not at all warranted. At the relevant time, the intention of the government was to rehabilitate the landless people whose lands had been acquired and to

provide employment to one member of the displaced family so that they could maintain the family so displaced. It was not at all the intention of the government to distribute this kind of

largesse on an indefinite basis. This is nothing but an abuse of the process of Court.â€

Having regard to the said order of the Supreme Court, we are of the opinion that the learned Single Judge was not right in giving the direction to

consider grant of such preference in recruitment in advertisement issued in future also for family members of the displaced families. Therefore, to that

extent the appeal is allowed and the said direction of the learned Single Judge in the impugned order is set aside.