

(2004) 06 NCDRC CK 0084

NATIONAL CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL COMMISSION**Case No:** None

V. MANGAMA RAJU

APPELLANT

Vs

State of orissa

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: June 21, 2004**Citation:** 2004 2 CPC 325 : 2004 3 CPJ 286**Hon'ble Judges:** Arati Mohanty , Pramodnath Das J.**Advocate:** R.K.Pattanaik

Judgement

1. THE complainant's case is that he is an unemployed youth. He had applied to the G.A. Department for allotment of a plot of land for running an STD/PCO booth for earning his livelihood in Satyanagar, Bhubaneswar. Opposite parties allotted a plot for running the PCO booth, vide Government order dated 1.3.1999.

2. THE complainant had deposited a sum of Rs. 3,650/- towards ground rent for one year vide treasury challan before the opposite parties for allotment of the land as per terms and conditions and also the declaration on affidavit.

After depositing the ground rent, the complainant was given delivery of possession of the plot by the opposite parties through their Revenue Inspector as well as the Land Officer on 28.4.1999. After having over the possession, on 30.4.1999 in order to set up the PCO booth he started preliminary work for installation of the cabin on the allotted land. While the complainant was working for construction of infrastructure, the local Goondas of Satyanagar area threatened the complainant not to instal the PCO booth. The complainant approached the opposite parties to give him protection and the opposite parties also assured him to protect. But necessary action has not

been taken by the opposite parties for which he could not run the PCO. He approached the opposite parties many times, that is on 30.6.1999, 5.1.2000, 17.11.2001 and 28.8.2002. On 2.6.2003 he approached the opposite parties to allot him an alternative site.

The complainant for his self-employment and to earn his livelihood is in need of a piece of land for running a PCO booth. He has suffered a lot due to financial difficulties because of non-installation of PCO for four years.

3. WE have gone through the materials on record. In our considered opinion, the opposite parties are to reconsider his case and to allot an alternative site in Bhubaneswar City for installation of an STD/PCO booth for which he will pay the rent of the land as per provisions of the Government.

We, therefore, direct the opposite parties to allot a piece of land as required for a PCO booth within Bhubaneswar City as they have allotted earlier, within three months from the receipt of this order. We make no order as to cost. Complaint allowed.