

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.130 of 2009**

1. Dr. Vivek Tiwari, aged about 37 years, S/o Late Shri V.R. Tiwari, occupation Service, R/o A-223, Harshit Towers, Hirapur Road, Tatibandh, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Dr. Nirmal Bhoi, aged about 38 years, S/o Shri J.R. Bhoi, occupation Service, R/o Qtr. No.LIG 88, Tilaknagar, Janata Colony, Gudiyaari, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**versus**

1. Registrar, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Raipur Homeopathic and Biochemic Association, through its President, Ramkund, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Raipur Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital, through Principal, Ramkund, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Selection Committee (Constituted under College Code 28), through Chairman (Adhyaksha) i.e. Vice Chancellor, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Dr. Avinash Rudrajwar, aged about 41 years, S/o Late Shri R.N.Rudrajwar, R/o Atharva Homeopathy Clinic, Shanti Vihar Colony, Near Daganiya Talab, Daganiya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. Dr. Sanjay Pandey, aged about 35 years, S/o Late Shri M.V. Pandey, R/o Shwet Hans Apartment, Housing Board Colony Complex, Deendayal Upadhyay Nagar, Rohinipuram, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
7. Dr. (Smt.) Rajshree Shukla, aged about 35 years, W/o Shri Aadarsh Shukla, R/o Bramhanpara, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate
For Respondent No.2	:	Shri Anurag Dayal Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****14/12/2015**

1. Heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioners and Respondent No.2.
2. The Petitioners were applicant for the post of Professor pursuant to an advertisement under the Central Council of Homeopathy, Homeopathy (Minimum Standards of Education) Regulations, 1983. They are aggrieved by not having been called for interview and question the consideration of Respondents No.5 to 7 by calling them for interview, contending them to be not eligible.

3. The counter-affidavit on behalf of Respondent No.2 was served on the Petitioners as far as back on 17.12.2009 specifically stating in paragraph 4(1) that the Petitioners were not eligible for consideration as they did not meet the twelve years' teaching experience. Respondents No.1 to 4 have set out the dates of their teaching experience to compute that they do not fulfill the eligibility.

4. No rejoinder has been filed even though nearly six years have gone by. If the Petitioners were not eligible to be considered and were not called for interview, they have no locus to question Respondents No.5 to 7 having been called for interview contending their ineligibility. In any event, the same counter-affidavit also states that Respondents No.5 to 7 were possessing the requisite qualifications and were applicants for different faculties from that of the Petitioners.

5. There is no merit in the writ application. It is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE