

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 1101 OF 2017

Omprakash Banjare, S/o Late Shri Mayaram Banjare, aged about 44 years,
R/o Village & Post – Telikot, Tahsil- Kharsiya, District Raigarh (C.G.)

... Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation Through Its President, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, Distt Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
4. The Secretary, Food Supplies And Consumer Protection, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Awadh Tripathi, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, Govt. Advocate and Mr. B.D. Guru, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

06/03/2017

1. Learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioners' case is not being considered by respondent authorities for regularization whereas, he is working with the Corporation for more than 10 years and is entitled for regularization and, therefore, he may be permitted to make representation before the competent authority and the same may be directed to be decided within the specific time frame.
2. Be that as it may, if the Petitioner files representation before the competent authority for redressal of his grievance, it is expected from the authority concerned to decide the same in the light of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others Vs. Umadevi and Others* [2006 (4) SCC 1] and in accordance with law, expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of representation of the Petitioner.

3. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the concerned authority would be at liberty to decide the same in accordance with law.

4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

/sharad/