

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**W.P.(S) No. 2403 OF 2016**

1. Sunil Kumar Sahu son of Shri Daduram Sahu, aged about 44 years, R/o Village & Post Itar, Tahsil Khairagarh, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)
2. Surendra Kumar Jagne son of Shri Prabhu Das Jagne, aged about 42 years, R/o Ravidas Nagar, Supela, Ward No. 4, Bhilai, Tahsil & District Durg (C.G.)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through-the Secretary, Panchayat and Social Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. Collector, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)
3. Incharge Officer, District Disability Rehabilitation Centre, Rajnandgaon, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)
4. Secretary, Indian Red Cross Society, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

---Respondents

For Petitioners	: Mr. C.J.K. Rao, Advocate
For respondents/State	: Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Dy. Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order on Board****28/06/2016**

1. By this petition, petitioners have prayed for issuance of direction to the respondent authorities to reinstate the petitioners on a contractual basis in a Rehabilitation Centre at Rajnandgaon.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that earlier petitioners were engaged on a contractual basis to work in the Rehabilitation Centre. Later on, their services were terminated because the Centre itself was closed. He further submits that petitioners have learnt that the Rehabilitation Centre has again become functional, therefore, in these circumstances,

petitioners ought to be reinstated on contractual basis. They made representation before the authorities for their reinstatement but till date, representation is not decided by the authorities and they have not been reinstated. Hence, this petition.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that engagement of the petitioners was purely contractual in nature, once contractual appointment has come to an end, no reinstatement could be claimed as of right on the ground that Rehabilitation Centre has again become functional. The petitioners are contractual employees and their engagement was coterminous with the functioning of the institution.

4. It is for the respondents to make appropriate arrangement for various works in the Rehabilitation Centre. No direction can be issued to appoint the petitioners as they were contractual employees. However, it is open to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioners and take appropriate decision thereon.

5. With the aforesaid observations, writ petition stands finally disposed off.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge