

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Appeal No. 39 of 2017**

Yavendra Kumar Mandhre S/o Shri Nagorao Mandhre, aged about 53 years, Electrician-I, Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, Transport Division, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) now posted as Constable Mining Department, Durg (C.G.) R/o Quarter No. D- 1, Housing Board Colony, Birgaon, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

---- Appellant**Versus**

Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, Transport Division, through the Divisional Manager Office of Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Transport Division Behind, L.I.C. Building Pandri, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Appellant : Shri Awadh Tripathi, Advocate

For Respondent : Shri Abhay Kumar Tiwari, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri P. Sam Koshy, Judge

Judgment on Board**10/04/2017**

1. We have heard the learned counsel for the Appellant and the learned counsel for the Respondent.
2. Under challenge is the order of the learned Single Judge refusing to come to the aid of the Appellant in the matter relating to his service with the Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation.
3. The Appellant was appointed in the post of Helper in Electrical Section in the Madhya Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation with effect from 20.05.1987. That institution to the extent it relates to the Appellant merged with the Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation. With no

document with him to show that he was ever appointed to officiate as Electrician Assistant Grade-I, he claimed relief as if he belongs to that category. Even the document which is shown to us by him through his learned counsel as among the exhibits in the writ petition relate only to his being appointed as Helper. As noted by the learned Single Judge, there is no document available to show that the Appellant was ever directed to officiate as Electrician Assistant Grade-I. The learned Single Judge went on to notice that the establishment did not challenge the order to the extent it was against it. It was also further noticed that if at all there is any claim relatable to the period of service of the Appellant with the Madhya Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation, that could not be decided without the said authority being arrayed as party.

4. Having examined the materials on record and the quality of finding rendered by the learned Single Judge in support of the impugned judgment, we do not find any ground to interfere with said judgment through this intra-court appeal. Therefore, this writ appeal fails.
5. In the result, the writ appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge