

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 3065 of 2015**

1. Suraj Kumar Yadu S/o Shri Nandu Lal Yadu Aged About 24 Years R/o Machkuri Line, Baloda Bazar, Present Address: Village Chhuiyaha (Malgajari) Tahsil & District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
2. Maheshwar Dhruv S/o Shri Ramayan Lal Dhruv Aged About 30 Years R/o Civil Line Parsa Bhader, Road Ward No. 20, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar- Bhathapara, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Shatrughan Prasad Kurre S/o Shri Khikhram Kurre Aged About 25 Years R/o Navrangpur, Post Office Purgaon, Block: Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar- Bhathapara, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Rajeshwar Kumar Koshariya S/o Shri Manglu Ram Koshariya, Aged About 26 Years R/o Village Limahi, Tahsil & District Baloda Bazar- Bhathapara, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Tilak Ram Yadav S/o Shri K. R. Yadav Aged About 26 Years R/o Civil Line, Qr. No.6, Tahsil & District Baloda Bazar- Bhathapara, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Revenue Department Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Election Officer, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. District Election Officer, District Baloda Bazar- Bathapara, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Deputy District Election Officer, District Baloda Bazar- Bhathapara, (Chhattisgarh)
5. The Collector, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar- Bhathapara, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Suresh Kumar Verma, Advocate
For Respondents-State	:	Shri PK Bhaduri, GA for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****21/08/2015**

1. Petitioners have preferred this writ petition seeking quashment of the orders dated 19-6-2014 and 24-6-2014, whereby the post on which they were appointed by the Collector-cum-District Election Officer, Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara has been abolished and they have been discontinued.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners would refer to clause 2 of the appointment order dated 16-1-2014, wherein it is mentioned that they are appointed for a probation period of two years, therefore, their discontinuance or removal prior to the said period is illegal.
3. It is settled law that an appointment order has to be read as a whole and any part of the document cannot be read in isolation. The opening part of the appointment order dated 16-1-2014 clearly stipulates that petitioners are appointed for the period 1-1-2014 to 30-6-2014, therefore, reference to the period of probation in clause 2 of the conditions of appointment appears to be an error. This is more so when the District Election Officer has issued an order in categorical terms that the post is abolished after 30-6-2014.
4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that petitioners may be permitted to prefer representations. Considering the fact that the petitioners have no right to continue on the post and, as a matter of fact, post itself is not available, no such direction can be issued to the authorities to consider petitioners' representations.
5. For the foregoing, the writ petition being devoid of any substance deserves to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

Judge
Prashant Kumar Mishra

Ashu