

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 4943 of 2008**

Smt. Sewati Sahu W/o Shri Hemraj Sahu, aged about 30 years, R/o of village Seoni, Police Station & Tahsil Abhanpur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

- 1.State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Tribal Welfare Department, Mantralaya, DKS Bhawan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector, Tribal Welfare Department, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 3.Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Welfare Department, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 4.Bhikham Ram Ongare S/o Sant Ram Ongare R/o of village Seoni, Police Station & Tahsil Abhanpur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Govind Dewangan, Advocate.
For Respondents/State	: Shri Prafull N Bharat, Additional Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****10/05/2016**

1. Heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the Learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the State.
2. The petitioner questions appointment of Respondent No. 4 on a Class IV post for the new High and Higher Secondary School claiming that she was the lone lady candidate.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner disputes the contention of the Respondent/State that she was not a resident of the same village as required under the advertisement.
4. Learned Additional Advocate General submits that the domicile certificate annexed by the Petitioner itself demonstrates that she did not reside in the concerned village as stipulated in the advertisement. There is no challenge to the terms of the advertisement. Respondent No. 4 being a resident of the village in

accordance with the terms of the advertisement was selected and is working since long. No other issue of ineligibility on part of Respondent No. 4 has been alleged. The post was not reserved for a lady candidate as sought to be contended in the writ petition.

5. In absence of any reservation of the seat for a lady candidate alone and the Petitioner not being a resident of the village in question, there being no challenge to the advertisement, the Court does not find any merit in the writ application.

6. The writ application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE