

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 5688 of 2017**

Shri Sanjay Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Rajeshwar Yadav, Aged About 23 Years Occupation Unemployed, R/o Village Bhelai Khurd, Tehsil Rajpur, Police Outpost Bariyaon, District Balrampur, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat Gramin Vibhag, Capital Complex, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Vivek Kumar Dubey S/o Shri Vijay Kant Dubey, Aged About 30 Years Village And Post Bariyon District Balrampur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Collector, Balrampur, District Balrampur, Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Rajpur District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
5. The Divisional Commissioner, Ambikapur, Sarguja Division District Sarguja Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

01.11.2017

Heard on admission.

1. The petitioner has assailed correctness and validity of the process of selection and appointment of respondent No.2 as Employment Assistant.
2. The selection process was completed and appointment order of respondent No.2 was passed on 03.10.2013. In the petition, it has not been

stated that the petitioner was not aware of this appointment order. It appears that thereafter the petitioner preferred some representation in 2014. Thereafter for almost two years, the petitioner slept over the matter and again started making representation in the month of November, 2016 followed by this petition filed in the month of October, 2017. The facts stated in the petition hardly make out a case for explanation for the delay in filing petition. The selection process was completed and appointment was made in 2013 itself. After four years, the petitioner has filed this petition. The grounds stated in the petition do not make out a case of satisfactory explanation for the delay in filing this petition. The petitioner has remained indolent. Applying well settled legal position that the discretionary relief under Article 226 of the Constitution of India would not come to the aid of a litigant, who had remained indolent in approaching the Court, the petition is liable to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge

Rekha