

Lobin Modi and Others Vs Steel Authority of India Ltd. A Govt. Company and Others

Court: Jharkhand High Court

Date of Decision: April 8, 2004

Acts Referred: Constitution of India, 1950 " Article 226

Citation: (2005) 1 JCR 384

Hon'ble Judges: Amareshwar Sahay, J

Bench: Single Bench

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

Amreshwar Sahay, J.

Heard Mr. Sahani, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Sen, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioners approached this Court earlier, in CWJC No. 1844 of 1999 (R) making a grievance that although they alongwith others were

appointed on daily wages basis as displaced persons in 1991 and some of them have been regularised in their services but case of the petitioners

have not been considered.

3. This Court disposed of the writ petition by order dated 14.01.2000 directing the petitioners to approach the Steel Authority of India Ltd. by

filing a representation for redressal of their grievance. The said order is annexed as Annexure-6 to the present writ application.

4. Pursuant thereto the petitioners filed a representation before the Steel Authority of India Ltd. which has been disposed of by a reasoned order

as contained in Annexure-8 by the General Manager, Bokaro Steel Plant. From perusal of the order of the General Manager, Bokaro Steel Plant,

as contained in Annexure-8 disposing of the representation filed by the petitioners, it appears that some relevant and important facts have been

taken note of, by him. Firstly that the displaced persons have been offered jobs in BSL on casual basis and all of them joined BSL in April, 1992

pending production of Land Vacation Certificate by them duly certified by DPLR. It was further noticed that at the time of joining Bokaro Steel

Ltd., the workers gave undertakings to the effect that they would vacate the homestead lands in the case of their appointment as casual workers,

but in spite of said undertakings, the land were not vacated despite of their appointment as displaced persons.

5. I find that the impugned order rejecting the representation of the petitioners cannot be said to be unjustified on the facts and grounds mentioned

in the impugned order.

6. I find no reason to interfere with the impugned order. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.