

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 143 of 2017**

- Raghunandan Prasad Yadav S/o Late Ledhayi Yadav, Aged About 52 Years Working On The Post Of Veterinary Compounder (Pashu Paricharak), Veterinary Hospital, Ghughra, Dist. Koriya (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Veterinary Services, Ministry At Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, P. S. Rakhi, Dist. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Directorate Of Veterinary Services, Indrawati Bhawan, Ground Floor, New Raipur, P. S. Rakhi, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Collector, Baikuthpur, District Koriya (Chhattisgarh)
4. Veterinary Assistant Surgeon, Assistant Veterinary Hospital, Ghughra, Dist. Koriya (Chhattisgarh)
5. Vikesh Kumar Paikra Veterinary Compounder (Pashu Paricharak), In The Office Of Joint Director Veterinary Services, Koriya, Dist. Koriya (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. R.K. Jha, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Adhiraj Surana, Dy. Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****07.03.2017**

1. The limited grievance of the Petitioner is that the Petitioner is working as veterinary compounder in the Veterinary Department of the State Government. According to the Petitioner he is eligible for promotion to the next higher post of Assistant Veterinary Medical Officer. It was also contended that the Respondents have also taken his consent for processing his name for the

promotion. As per rule before promotion to the next higher post in the department from the post of compounder they are sent for training for Veterinary Polytechnic Diploma course which is of 24 months duration. The grievance of the Petitioner is that vide the Annexure P1 dated 20.12.2016 a list has been published for eligible candidates for undergoing said diploma Course and in the list the name of the Petitioner is not reflected whereas a person junior to the Petitioner has found place in the said list.

2. According to the Petitioner, he has not been intimated by the Respondents authorities as to why his name has not been included in the list nor has he been given any letter holding him ineligible for the said course.
3. This matter came up for admission on 16.01.2017 on which date this Court has granted time to the Respondent State to seek instruction. Today when the matter is listed after about 1½ months time, today also the Counsel for the Respondent State submits that he has not received any instruction from the concerned department.
4. Be that as it may, this Court does not intend to keep the Petition pending any further. Accordingly the present Petition is disposed off with a direction to the Director of the Department/Respondent No.2 to look into the grievance of the Petitioner and to pass an appropriate order within a period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

5. It would be the duty of the Petitioner to apprise Respondent No.2 in respect of the order passed by this Court along with a fresh detailed representation within a period of 2 weeks. The authorities shall take decision thereafter within a further period of 6 weeks.
6. With the aforesaid observation the present Writ Petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE