

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 1390 of 2017**

Siyaram Jaiswal S/o Shri Bhuneshwar Jaiswal, aged about 63 years, Retired Transport Inspector, Regional Transport Office, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) R/o Jarhabhata, Bilaspur, Tahsil and District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Department of Transport, Secretariat, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, P. S. and Post Rakhi District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. Commissioner (Transport) Chhattisgarh, Office of the Transport Commissioner, C- Block, third Floor, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur, P. S. and Post Rakhi, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
3. Additional Commissioner (Transport) Chhattisgarh, Office of the Commissioner (Transport) Chhattisgarh, C- Block, Third Floor, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur, P. S. and Post Rakhi District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
4. Regional Transport Officer, Office of the Regional Transport, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Shahid Ahmed Ansari, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****22/03/2017**

The present writ petition has been filed seeking for the relief of a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for being promoted on the post of Assistant Regional Transport Officer.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had been making oral request to the superior authorities for promotion but they have not considered the same.
3. At the outset, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition as it suffers from delay and laches. The petitioner retired from service on the post

of Transport Inspector w.e.f. 30.09.2015. The present writ petition has been preferred as late as on 17.03.2017 seeking for a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for promotion from the post of Transport Inspector to the post of Assistant Regional Transport Officer w.e.f. 01.10.2014.

4. The petitioner during the period when he was in service did not thought it proper for seeking the said relief. Even after his retirement the petitioner seems to have slept for about one and a half year and now he thought for filing of the present writ petition.

5. Thus, this Court does not find any strong case made out for a direction to the respondents for considering the case of the petitioner for promotion at this belated stage i.e. after about 1 ½ years from the date of his retirement.

6. Since the instant writ petition suffers from delay laches, it deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

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