

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WP No. 4776 of 2005**

Smt. Asha Pandey, W/o. Shri S.P. Pandey, Aged about 42 years, R/o. Nariyal Kothi, Dayalband, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Guru Ghasidas University, Through: The Registrar, Guru Ghasidas University, Koni, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Dy. Registrar (Administration), Guru Ghasidas University, Koni, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Archana Saxena, Assistant Librarian, Guru Ghasidas University, Koni, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. Ku. Afsha Ansari, Assistant Librarian, Guru Ghasidas University, Koni, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate
For the respective respondents:		Mr. Ashish Shrivastava, Advocate
		Mr. Neeraj Choubey, Advocate
		Mr. Hemant Gupta, Advocate
		Mr. Soumya Roy, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****02/07/2018**

1. The claim in the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondents to grant appointment to the petitioner on the post of Assistant Librarian.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that an advertisement was issued on 30.01.2004 for filling up the post of Assistant Librarian and one such post was kept for the unreserved category, in which the petitioner had also applied. Thereafter there is no further development which has been shown by the respondents on the said advertisement.
3. The contention of the petitioner is that the respondents ought to have concluded the recruitment process having once issued the

advertisement and the petitioner has every right to participate in the recruitment process and the respondents also are duty bound to conclude the recruitment process by finalizing the appointment.

4. The contention raised by the petitioner does not find strength in the light of the settled legal position that merely because the respondents had issued an advertisement calling for filling up the post by itself would not give an indefeasible right in favour of the petitioner for seeking appointment. There could be many reasons, on which the respondents have not proceeded further with the recruitment process.
5. During the course of hearing, the counsel for the petitioner submits that after the issuance of the advertisement, the respondents themselves have granted appointment to the respondents No.3 & 4 on the post of Assistant Librarian.
6. Perusal of the record would show that the said appointment of the respondents No.3 & 4 is not under challenge in the present writ petition. The mode of appointment of the respondents is also not reflected in the writ petition.
7. Given the said facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that no substantive right has been created in favour of the petitioner for the relief sought for and the writ petition thus being devoid of merit deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge