



CGHC010207492022



2026:CGHC:38201

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 4558 of 2022**

1 - Basant Kumar Lohile S/o Shri Budhari Lohile Aged About 45 Years R/o Village Ghoghra, Tahsil Rajim, P.S.- Fingeshwar, District- Gariyaband, Chhattisgarh
... **Petitioner**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Of School And Education Department Capital Complex, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - District Education Officer Kabirdham, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh

3 - District Education Officer Kawardha, Kabirdham, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Executive Officer Zilla Panchayat Kawardha, Kabirdham, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh

5 - Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Pandriya, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh

6 - Block Education Officer Pandariya, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh
---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Ms. Khushboo Lalchandani, Advocate holding the brief of
Mr. A.K. Yadav, Advocate
For State : Mr. Vivek Mishra, Panel Lawyer
For respondent No.4 &5 : Mr. Shikhar Shukla, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**Order on Board****25.08.2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking following relief (s) :

“10.1 That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire record pertaining to the present case.

10.2 That this Hon'ble Court may please to quash the impugned order dated 01.12.2015 (ANNEXURE P-1) Passed by the Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Pandariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.).

10.3 That this Hon'ble Court may please to quash the advertisement dated 19.07.2019 ANNEXURE P/2 passed by the Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Pandariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.).”

2. Mr. Mishra, learned Panel Lawyer appearing for the State, would submit that according to the Chhattisgarh Panchayats (Appeal and Revision) Rules, 1995 (for short, 'the Rules of 1995'), against the order passed by the Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Pandariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.), an appeal would lie before the Collector. He would further submit that the present petition is not maintainable, as an efficacious alternative remedy is available to the petitioner.
3. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.
4. Taking into consideration the fact that an efficacious alternative remedy of filing an appeal before the Collector is available to the petitioner, in my opinion, the present petition is not maintainable and is, accordingly, **dismissed**. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to prefer a duly constituted appeal before the Collector in accordance with the provisions of the Rules of 1995. In turn, the authority concerned is directed to decide the same expeditiously.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge