

PETITIONER:
STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA LTD.(SUCCESSOR TO HINDUSTAN STEEL L

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION OF INDIA & ORS.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 09/05/1997

BENCH:
K. RAMASWAMY, D.P. WADHWA

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R

This special leave petition has been filed against the order of the High Court of Delhi, made on 13.3.1997 in C.W. No. 1085/97.

The predecessor of the petitioner-Company had taken on rent the disputed premises, from the Life Insurance Corporation, on 4th floor of Jeevan Deep Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi. Since the petitioner had not vacated the premises, action was taken for eviction under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act. The petitioner challenged the action in the High Court contending that this Court has issued directions in I.A. Nos. 4 and 4 of 1992 in Civil Appeal Nos. 2058-59/88 to constitute a High-power Committee to resolve the disputes between the Public Sector Undertaking and the Government of India of the concerned Ministry, by a Committee composed of Cabinet Secretary, Secretary in Ministry of Law and Secretary in the Bureau of Public Sector Undertakings to decide the disputes without needless consumption of time and waste of public funds. The petitioner has sought for such a reference and contends the High-power Committee should have been constituted and decided the matter. We find no force in the contention.

The object of issuing direction in those matters was to decide the fiscal disputes in case of major policy matter to save the public money and court valuable time, and disputes could amicably be settled between the Public Sector Undertaking and the Government of India or the State Government. The intention was not to resolve the disputes like eviction of a company or public Undertaking under Public Premises (Unauthorised Occupants) Act; such petty disputes are not directed to be dealt with by the High level officers whose otherwise duty and time is of very important nature. Under these circumstances, the High Court has not committed any error warranting interference.

The special leave petition is accordingly dismissed.