

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 7613 of 2007**

- Monika Choure D/o Shri S. L. Choure, aged about 24 years, Occupation - Programme Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Kanker, District - Uttar Bastar, Kanker (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Union Of India, through Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat and Rural Development Department, Rural Engineering Service, D.K.S. Building, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Commissioner, Rozgar Guarantee Yojna, Development Commissioner Office, Vikas Bhavan, Civil Lines, Raipur (C.G.)
4. Collector, District - Kanker (C.G.)
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Kanker, District Kanker (CG)
6. Chief Executive Officer, District Panchayat, Kanker, District – Uttar Bastar Kanker (CG)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner

Mr. Raghvendra Verma, Advocate

For Respondent/State

Mr. Satish Gupta, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra
Order On Board

17/4/2017

1. Heard.
2. The petitioner was working as Programme Officer in the Rozgar Guarantee Scheme under Janpad Panchayat, Kanker, District Kanker. During the term of the contract, the petitioner was served with a show cause notice to explain the dereliction in

duty. The reply/explanation submitted by the petitioner was not found to be satisfactory, therefore, her contract appointment was terminated.

3. Admittedly, the term of appointment was for one year from the date of appointment i.e. 29.06.2006, which was extended till 31.12.2007 vide Annexure P/3. Thus, the period of contract came to an end on 31.12.2007.
4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the order of termination being stigmatic, a regular departmental enquiry should have been conducted against the petitioner.
5. Clause 5 of the Contract Appointment Order stipulates that during the term of contract appointment, any party to the contract can terminate the services by giving one month's notice. The petitioner was served with a show cause notice on 20.08.2007 (Annexure P/6) and thereafter, the order of termination was passed on 24.11.2007 i.e. after more than a month. Thus, the order of termination has been issued in accordance with the terms of the contract appointment, therefore, it does not suffer from any legal infirmity. Moreover, the term of the appointment has already come to an end.
6. For all the above stated reasons, there is no substance in the present writ petition. It is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-

Judge

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)