

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCC No. 345 of 2017**

Smt. Sunita Shrivastava W/o Shri Kapil Shrivastava, Aged About 41 Years
Posted As Assistant Grade- II, Civil Court Champa District Janjgir Champa
(Chhattisgarh).

-----Applicant**Versus**

1. District Judge Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh).
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Principal Secretary, Law Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Smt. Jyoti Niware, Reader Grade- III, District Court, Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
4. Smt. Monika Verma, Reader Grade- III, Civil Court, Akaltara, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
5. Vikram Sahu, Assistant Grade- II, Civil Court, Sakti, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
6. Rakesh Kumar Jaiswal, Assistant Grade- II, District Court, Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
7. Smt. Chitrlekha Dewangan, Assistant Grade- II, Nawagarh, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
8. Amiteshdev Kurre, Assistant Grade- II, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
9. Smt. Kalindri Mathru, Assistant Grade- II, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
10. Smt. Laxmi Shrivastava (Ramteke), Assistant Grade- II, District Court, Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
11. Smt. Ishwari Anant, Assistant Grade- II, District Court, Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
12. Ramratan Dahariya, Assistant Grade- II, Civil Court, Akaltara, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
13. Vinod Kumar Maravi, Assistant Grade- II, Civil Court, Jaijaipur, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondents

For Applicant : Shri TK Jha, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****04/05/2017**

1. The instant MCC has been preferred seeking for modification of the order dated 24.03.2017 passed in Writ Petition (S) No.6337 of 2016.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the applicant submits that the modification which has been sought for is to the extent of granting liberty to the applicant to prefer a representation before the respondents, however, from the order dated 24.03.2017 it does not reflect of the said liberty being sought, though prayer was made by the applicant in his application.
3. In view of the fact, that the order dated 24.03.2017 does not reflect anything with regard to liberty of making representation, this court would be reluctant to modify the order dated 24.03.2017. Needless to mention that the only indulgence that the counsel for applicant seeks for making representation to the respondents, in the opinion of this court, without any observation in the order of writ court, the said liberty would always be available to the applicant, for making a representation to the competent authority.
4. With the aforesaid observation, the MCC stands dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge