NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Appeal No. 444 of 2015

1. Suraj Kumar Yadu son of Shri Nandu Lal Yadu, aged about 24 years, R/o Machkuri Line, Baloda Bazar, Present Address Village Chhuiyaha (Malgujari) Tahsil and District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
2. Maheshwar Dhruv son of Shri Ramayan Lal Dhruv aged about 30 years, R/o civil line Parsa Bhader, Road Ward No. 20, Baloda Bazar, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.
3. Shatrughan Prasd Kurre son of Shri Khikhram Kurre, aged about 25 years, R/o Navrangpur, Post Office Purgaon, Block Kasdol, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.
4. Rajeshwar Kumar Koshariya son of Shri Manglu Ram Koshariya, aged about 26 years, R/o village Limahi, Tahsil and District District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.
5. Tilak Ram Yadav son of Shri K.R.Yadav, aged about 26 years, R/o Civil Line Qr. No. 6, Tahsil and District District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

---- Appellants

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary, Revenue Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Chief Election Officer, Raigarh Chhattisgarh.
3. District Education Officer, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.
4. Deputy District Election Officer, District District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.
5. Collector, Balodabazar, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Appellants	:	Shri Suresh Kumar Verma, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Prafull N Bharat, Additional Advocate General.

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

Judgment on Board

Per Navin Sinha, Chief Justice

22/09/2015

1. The present appeal arises from order dated 21.8.2015 dismissing Writ Petition (S) No. 3065 of 2015. The Learned Single Judge held that the post itself having been abolished, no relief could be granted to the Appellants.

2. Learned Counsel for the Appellant makes a very short submission that the Learned Single Judge ought to have permitted the Appellants to file a representation as had been submitted on their behalf.

3. What the Appellants may wish to do or not is for them to decide alone. We find no reason to interfere with the order under appeal.

4. The writ appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

Subbu