



CGHC010324962019



2026:CGHC:31665

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 7927 of 2019**

1 - Kamal Dewangan S/o Shri Mansai Dewangan Aged About 54 Years Presently Posted As Sub Engineer, Water Resource Department, Division And District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh R/o Ward No. 13, Purani Basti, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa Chhattisgarh, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Water Resource Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Engineer-In-Chief Water Resource Department Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Chief Engineer Water Resource Department Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

4 - Executive Engineer Water Resource Department Champa, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner : None

For Respondents-State : Mr. Amit Buxy, Dy. Government Advocate

SB: Hon'ble Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal, Judge**ORDER ON BOARD****24/07/2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1 Set-aside the impugned order dated 21.06.2019 (Annexure P/1).

10.2 Issue writ(s)/order(s)/direction(s) in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents' authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner afresh for grant of benefit of regular pay scale and seniority from the initial date of appointment in light of parity as granted to similarly situated employees though posted in other department but working under the umbrella of State.

10.3 Any other relief that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be granted in favour of the petitioner against the respondents.”

2. Perusal of the records and order-sheets would show that, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner on 06.11.2025.
3. Today also, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner even when the case is taken up for hearing in the second round.
4. In the aforementioned facts of the case, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss this writ petition for want of prosecution.
5. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
 Judge

SHUBHAM DEY	Digitally signed by SHUBHAM DEY
----------------	--

Dey