

c. 8.1001

2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR
WRIT PETITION NO. 1906 OF 2005

PETITIONER

✓ PRAHLAD AADO, SON OF
SHRI KALPU AADO, AGED
ABOUT 55 YEARS, RESIDENT
OF KHONGAPANI, DISTRICT
KORIYA (CHHATTISGARH).

VS

RESPONDENTS

✓ 1. SOUTH EASTERN
COALFIELDS LTD.,
THROUGH THE CHAIRMAN
CUM MANAGING
DIRECTOR, SEEPAT ROAD,
BILASPUR [C.G.]

✓ 2. THE PERSONNEL
MANAGER (I.R), SECL,
SEEPAT ROAD, BILASPUR
[C.G.]

✓ 3. THE MINE
SUPERINTENDENT
MANAGER, PALKIMORA
MINES, DISTRICT KORIYA.

P.R. No. 2084/05
Presented by Shri. Ratan Dubey
dated 07.05.05



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227 & 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF AN
APPROPRIATE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS
/ CERTIORARI ETC OR DIRECTION(S) / ORDER(S)
IN THE LIKE NATURE ETC.

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक WP. 1906 / 05 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<p><u>13-5-2005</u></p> <p>Miss Sharmila Singhai, counsel for the petitioner.</p> <p>Shri P.S. Koshy, counsel for the respondents.</p> <p>Heard both the counsel.</p> <p>The petitioner has preferred this writ petition being aggrieved by the notice Annexure-P/1 whereby the petitioner has been informed that he will be retiring on 31st July 2005 on attaining 60 years' age.</p> <p>By this petition he has raised the grievance that he is an illiterate person even at the time of filling up of the form Annexure-P/2. He informed the authorities that his age has been recorded 5 years more and note to that effect was appended on Annexure-P/2, but no action was taken by the authorities and the petitioner being an illiterate person could not pursue the matter. Thereafter, he made a representation (Annexure-P/3) before the authority in the month of April, 2005, but they are not taking any action, therefore, Annexure-P/1 be quashed and the matter may be referred to the Age Determination Committee.</p> <p>In this connection, learned counsel for the petitioner while placing reliance on the Instruction No.76 (Annexure-P/4) submitted that as per sub clause IV of Clause A where there was no document showing the age of the petitioner and even at the time of appointment</p>	

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
Barve	<p>he ought to have been examined by the Doctor in order to determine his age, but the same was not done, therefore, the matter should be referred to the Age Determination Committee.</p> <p>Learned counsel for respondents has no objection to the limited request made by learned counsel for the petitioner.</p> <p>Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, respondent No.2 is directed to refer the case of the petitioner before the Age Determination Committee within a period of 10 days and in turn the Age Determination Committee shall decide his age after following the prescribed procedure and send the report to the concerned authority by <u>15th July 2005</u>.</p> <p>With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.</p> <p>Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.1498/2005 and I.A. No.3590/2005 also stand disposed of.</p> <p>Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.</p>	<p>Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge</p>

SP/FS/2005 - 20,000

24/5/05