

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No.93 of 2017.

Dr. Smt. Rama Singh W/o Dr. Prem Sai Singh, aged about 47 Years
Child Specialist, Presently Posted As District Immunisation Officer,
District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Department Of Health and Family Welfare D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Health Services Government Of Chhattisgarh, Old Nursing Hospital, D.K.S. Bhawan Premises, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Chief Medical And Health Officer District Hospital, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Dr. S.K. Medrik Child Specialist, Presently Posted At District Hospital, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
5. Dr. Sanjeev Balwant Mangarulkar Incharge District Health Officer, Office Of The Chief Medical And Health Officer, District Hospital, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Jitendra Pali, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

05/09/2017

1. The present review petition has been filed seeking for review of the order dated 21/02/2017 passed by this court in WPS No.4921/2011.
2. The grievance of the petitioner which led to the filing of the review petition was the fact that, on earlier round of litigation, the respondents have been directed for holding the DPC which the respondents till date have not conducted.
3. This ground raised by the petitioner also has been dealt by this court while disposal of the original Writ Petition in its order dated 21/02/2017. The operative part of the order is reproduced herein as under:

4."So far as the prayer for convening DPC and non granting of promotion is concerned, this court is not inclined to issue any direction in this regard to the respondents at this

junction. The issue is left open. The petitioner is at liberty to make detailed representation in this regard to the respondents No.1 & 2, who in turn shall look into the grievance so far as non holding of DPC is concerned and shall either hold the DPC or suitably inform the petitioner the reasons for not convening the DPC”.

4. Plain reading of the operative part of the said order would clearly reflect that, this court has given a specific direction to the respondents to either hold DPC within a reasonable period or intimate the petitioner as to reasons for which the respondents cannot hold the DPC. If the respondents hold the DPC then perhaps the entire grievance of the petitioner would get redressed. If that be so, filing of the present review petition is totally uncalled for.
5. The review petition thus fails and is accordingly rejected.
6. Further while disposing of the review petition, this court feels it proper to direct the respondents to ensure the compliance of the order dated 21/02/2017 passed by this court in WPS No.4921/2011 within a period of three months from today, particularly for the reason that as the original order itself was decided about seven months back and according to the petitioner, no steps have been taken by the respondents for compliance of the directions so given.
7. Therefore, it is expected that, the respondents shall make all endeavors for compliance of the directions so given within the time limit as afore mentioned.
8. The review petition stands rejected with the aforesaid observation.

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