

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 2812 of 2016**

- Smt. Vinita Pandey W/o Shri Rakesh Pandey Aged About 40 Years R/o Ram Gopal Tiwari Ward, Pathakpara, Mungeli District Mungeli (Chhattisgarh)

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through : The Secretary, Department Of Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Engineer In Chief, Public Works Department Shirpur Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Bilaspur Division Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Superintending Engineer, Public Works Department Bilaspur Division Bilaspur District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Public Works Department, Sub Division Champa, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
6. Rakesh Pandey, S/o Shri Jhumuklal Pandey, Aged About 46 Years Posted As Spot Assistant (Time Keeper) P. W. D. Department, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

**---- Respondents**

---

|                                |                                       |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner                 | : Mr. C.B. Kesharwani, Advocate       |
| For State / Respondents 1 to 5 | : Mr. S.P. Kale, Dy. Advocate General |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**

**Order on Board**

**12-07-2016**

Heard.

- 1) This petition has been filed by the petitioner / wife of respondent No.6 challenging the order dated 13.04.2016 by which the order of suspension has been revoked.
- 2) Though number of grounds have been raised by the petitioner to assail propriety and validity of the order, by which, suspension has been revoked, there is no need to examine those grounds in this petition for short reason that the petitioner has no locus to challenge the order of revocation of suspension of respondent No.6. It appears that the

petitioner has strained relation with her husband / respondent No.6, for which, she has also made certain complaints, which relate to criminal cases. But the petitioner has no locus to challenge the orders concerning matters of respondent No.6. The petitioner has not suffered any legal injury, therefore, the instant petition is misconceived in law.

- 3) The petition is accordingly dismissed with the cost of Rs.1,000/-.

Sd/-  
**(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)**  
JUDGE