

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Appeal No.346 of 2015**

1. Kamal Ram Sahu, s/o Shri Ganpat Ram Sahu, aged about 39 years, presently working as In-charge Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Service under Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Balod Division, PS Civil Lines, Balod, Chhattisgarh
2. Varun Rajput, S/o Shri Manoj Rajput, aged about 30 years, presently working as In-charge Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Service under Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Korba Division, PS Civil Lines, Korba, Chhattisgarh
3. Vinod Kumar Minj, S/o Shri Simon Minj aged about 40 years, presently working as Sub-Divisional Officer, Dharamjaigarh, PS Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Appellants**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Panchayat and Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Engineer, Development Commissioner Office, Civil Lines, Raipur, PS Civil Lines, Civil and Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Service, Division Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
4. The Executive Engineer, PMGSY Division Janjgir-Champa, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
5. Bhashaj Lal Kolkatti, S/o Shri Dukalu Ram, aged about 55 years, working as Assistant Engineer, PMGSY Implementation Unit, PS Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Appellants	: Shri N. Naha Roy, Advocate
For State/Respondents No.1 to 4	: Shri U.N.S.Deo, Government Advocate
For Respondent No.5	: None

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board**Per NAVIN SINHA, C.J.****23/7/2015**

1. The office has raised an objection that the Appellants were not parties to the writ petition and which defect was directed to be considered at the time of admission.
2. Learned Counsel for the Appellants submits that the matter relates to promotion and there is a need to decide the representation of

the private Respondent expeditiously. There is no mention in the order about any time limit by which the representation must be disposed.

3. In the limited nature of the question arising for our consideration we over-rule the office objection with regard to maintainability and dispose this appeal with the observation that where no time limit is indicated in an order, performance has to be within a reasonable time.

4. The appeal is disposed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE