

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (PIL) No. 69 of 2017**

Ravi Khande S/o. Mr. Babulal Khande, Aged About 24 Years R/o Village Kurda,
Block Malkharoda, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Secretary, Tribal Welfare Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Director, Public Instructions, Directorate, Indrawati Bhavan, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Collector, Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
5. Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Welfare Development Department, Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
6. District Education Officer, Sakti, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
7. Shri Shail Kumar Pandey, Assistant Teacher, Govt. Balak Ashram, Amaldiha, Block Sakti, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri H.B. Agrawal, Senior Advocate with Shri U.R. Koshaley, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Shri Y.S. Thakur, Additional Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Sanjay Agrawal, Judge.

Order on Board**Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice****08/05/2017**

1. We have heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the Learned Additional Advocate General quite in extensio.
2. This writ petition is filed challenging the Government's decision to award the 7th Respondent with the State Level Teacher Award. The Petitioner tries to

demonstrate that the 7th Respondent could not have been considered in view of certain disciplinary proceedings or adverse remarks against him. Conferring an award of the nature in hand, is primarily a matter in the executive domain. Guidelines are prescribed. Within the format of those guidelines, it is up to the Government to take a decision which will appeal to the people and which will be taken with due value by the masses. That is not a matter which could be debated and deliberated upon on the judicial side since it is neither the conferment of any public office or any particular title dependent on statutory rules. Very many indiciae may go into such matters which leads to grant of such awards. The multitude considerations at the level of governance may always not be those which could be considered on any yardstick which will be available on the basis of legal rules though transparency cannot be ruled out.

3. With the materials on record, we are unable to hold that picking up the 7th Respondent for the conferment of the award is justiciable through a public interest litigation at the instance of the Petitioner. We therefore do not find any ground to entertain this matter as a public interest litigation. It also does not involve any public interest as such, since the question is only as to whether a particular individual had to be given the award. The Petitioner does not question the Government's wisdom to provide for such awards. On the whole, we are satisfied that this is not a case which deserves to be entertained under Article 226 of the Constitution of India as a public interest litigation. This matter therefore fails.

4. In the result, this writ petition is dismissed in limine.

5. Whatever security amount deposited by the Petitioner will be accounted as costs paid towards the Chhattisgarh High Court Middle Income Group Legal Aid Society, Bilaspur.

Sd/-

(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(Sanjay Agrawal)
JUDGE