

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 6545 OF 2016**

Umesh Kumar Goyal, S/o Shri Melaram Goyal, aged about 29 years, R/o Village Centre Koni, Ramayan Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

**... Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through its Secretary, Health & Family Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Director, Directorate of Health Services, Indrawati Bhawan IIIrd Floor, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
3. Collector, Balod, District Balod (C.G.)
4. The Chief Medical & Health Officer, Balod, District Balod (C.G.)
5. Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board, through its Secretary, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

**... Respondents**

|                 |   |                                                                                 |
|-----------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner  | : | Mr. Ishan Verma, Advocate, under instructions of Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate. |
| For Respondents | : | Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, Deputy Government Advocate.                              |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**07/03/2017**

1. By way of the present writ petition, the Petitioner has sought for a direction to the Respondent-Chief Medical & Health Officer to complete the selection process initiated for filling up of the post of Pharmacist Grade-II.
2. Grievance of the Petitioner is that he has participated as a handicapped candidate in the said selection process and he has also been successful, but for some reasons or other the appointment order has not been issued by the Respondents.
3. The Respondents have now filed a detailed reply. In paragraph 10 of their reply, the Respondents have admitted the fact that from perusal of the record it appears that the Petitioner is a meritorious candidate under the Physically Handicapped Category and that the case of the Petitioner would be considered at the earliest.

4. In view of the categorical admission made on the part of the Respondents in their reply particularly in paragraph 10 of the reply, this Court is of the view that nothing further remains to be adjudicated upon in the present writ petition.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of, with a direction to Respondent No.2 to look into the grievance of the Petitioner and if required, issue order of appointment in his favour in case he is found meritorious as has been stated by the Respondents in their reply, within a period of 60 days from today.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands allowed and disposed of.

Sd/-  
**(P. Sam Koshy)**  
Judge