

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**W.P.(S) No. 1256 of 2009**

Rajaram Thawait S/o late Shri Narayan Prasad Thawait aged about 55 years, R/o Rangolipara, Raigarh, Tahsil and District-Raigarh, (CG)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Department of Urban Administration, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (CG)
2. Commissioner, Nagar Palika Nigam, Raigarh (CG)
3. Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Palika Nigam, Raigarh, (CG)
4. Shri Sonwa Das, Revenue Sub Inspector, Nagar Palika Nigam, Raigarh (CG)
5. Makardhwaj Malakar S/o Late Kunj Bihari Malakar, Revenue Sub Inspector, Nagar Palika Nigam, Raigarh, (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Manish Upadhyay, Advocate
For Respondent no. 1	:	Shri Garry Mukhopadhyay, Dy. Govt. Advocate
For Respondents 2 & 3	:	Ms. Puspa Dwivedi, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****09/10/2015**

The petitioner through the present writ petition has sought for a relief for consideration of his promotion w.e.f. 07.07.2008 i.e. the date on which respondents 4 & 5 were promoted to the post of Revenue Sub Inspector from the post of Assistant Revenue Inspector.

2. Notices in this case were issued to the respondents as early as in March, 2009 and respondent no.2, the contesting respondent filed reply in April, 2009 categorically coming up with the stand that the petitioner does not have the minimum requisite qualification i.e. 12th Class passed on account of which the case of the petitioner was not considered for the post of Revenue Sub Inspector.

3. So far as respondents 4 & 5 are concerned, again respondent no.2 in their reply have specifically mentioned that as respondents 4 & 5 were 12th class passed and fulfilled the minimum eligibility criteria, they were promoted to the said post. There is no rejoinder filed by the petitioner rebutting the submission made by respondent no.2, the

contesting party in their reply. In the entire pleading of the petition, the petitioner has not disclosed anything in respect of the minimum education qualification for the post of Revenue Sub Inspector.

4. Considering the total facts and circumstances of the case particularly the fact that there is a specific submission made by respondent no.2 that the petitioner does not have minimum education qualification for the post he is claiming promotion and to this fact there also being no rebuttal by the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition any further.

5. Thus, the present writ petition being devoid of merit deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**