

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 907of 2016

Gandhi Sewa Samiti Dabhara, Through President Shri Bhagwati Prasad Shukla,
S/o Late Shri Heera Lal Shukla, Aged About 75 Years, R/o Post Misda, Village
Misda, Thana Nawagarh, Civil & Revenue Distt. Janjgir Champa, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Sub Divisional Officer, Katghora, Distt. Korba, (Chhattisgarh)
3. District Education Officer, Korba, Distt. Korba, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

Shri Anshul R. Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri Satish Gupta, Govt. Advocate for the State on advance copy.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

11/04/2016

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has submitted application before the competent authority i.e. the District Education Officer for grant of permission to open and run a school. He submits that the application filed before respondent No.3 for opening of school at different places have remained pending without any decision. It is brought to the notice of this Court that in the matter of petitioner's application for grant of permission to open a school at Urga, a writ petition was earlier filed, registered as WPC No.36/2016, which was finally disposed off vide order dated 08/02/2016 with a direction to consider petitioner's application in accordance with law. He submits that similar direction may also be issued as the present case is also in relation to opening of school at Pali which is within the same district and within the jurisdiction of the District Education Officer, Korba.

2. Learned State counsel submits that the Court may dispose off the matter

with a direction to the District Education Officer to take decision on petitioner's application in accordance with law.

3. In view of above, the petition is disposed off with a direction to respondent no.3 to decide petitioner's application for grant of permission in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

It goes without saying that if the order passed is against the petitioner, the petitioner would be at liberty to take recourse to remedy as provided under the law.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge