

(6)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (S) No. 3534 OF 2013.

Single Bench

PETITIONER


: Mohan Lal Kaiwart
S/o. Battu Lal Kaiwart, aged
about 37 years, Shiksha
Karmi Grade-II, Govt.
Primary School
Bijrakapakala, Janpad
Panchayat Lormi, P. S. Lormi,
Revenue District Mungeli,
Civil District Bilaspur (C.G.)

3534/13
Presented by Sri
21/10/13
Noted

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

- :1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through : The Secretary,
Education Department,
Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur
(C.G.)
2. Collector,
Mungeli, District Mungeli
(Chhattisgarh)
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Lormi
District Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad
Panchayat Lormi, District
Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)




J. S. S.


7 (2)

2.

5. District Education Officer,
Mungeli District Mungeli
(Chhattisgarh)
6. Block Education Officer,
Lormi, Block Lormi, District
Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)
7. Bhartiya Shiksha Parishad,
Uttar Pradesh, Through
Director Bhartiya Parishad
Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh)



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA



उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक... 3534/13 सन् 201

28

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	S.B.: HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRITINKER DIWAKER 05.03.2015 Smt. Meena Shastri, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Vaibhav Goverdhan, P.L. for the State. Challenge in the present petition is to the order dated 29.07.2013 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Lormi- respondent No.4. Counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that against the order impugned appeal lies to the Collector. She further submits that as the petitioner was prosecuting this petition his appeal would be time barred and therefore respondent No.2 be directed to decide the appeal of the petitioner expeditiously ignoring the point of limitation. State counsel submits that till date the petitioner has not preferred any appeal and therefore instead of condoning the delay, discretion be given to the appellate authority to decide the application if any, filed in this respect. Accordingly the petitioner is permitted to withdraw this petition with the aforesaid liberty. In the eventuality of filing any appeal by the petitioner against the order impugned it is expected from the Collector to decide the same expeditiously ignoring the point of limitation. No observation on the merits of the case has been made by this Court and the appellate authority would be at liberty to decide the appeal in accordance with law.	

Sd/-
Pritinker Diwakar
Judge