

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 3781 of 2011

1. Ashok Kumar Pandey S/o Jivan Lal Pandey, aged about 35 years, working on the post of Chowkidar, Anusuchit Jati Kanya Chhatravas, Takhatpur, District Bilaspur (C.G.), R/o village Salhedhori, Post Lagara, Tahsil Lormi, Bilaspur (C.G.).
2. Surendra Singh Rajput S/o Ramsanehi, aged about 28 years, working on the post of Cook at Post Metric Adivasi Balak Chhatravas, Gourela, R/o village Chhapal, Post Chhapal, Tahsil Lormi, Bilaspur (C.G.).
3. Sanjay Kumar Kant S/o Late Shri Atmaram Kant, aged about 30 years, working on the post of cook at Pre Metric Adivasi Balak Chhatravas, Bodsara, R/o village Jalso, Post Office Sukulari, Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.).
4. Vijay Kumar Sandilya S/o Late Shri Tikaram Sandilya, aged about 22 years, working on the post of cook at Pre Metric Adivasi Balak Chhatravas, Bhattchoura, R/o village Chouha, Post Office Tikari, Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.).
5. Shail Devi Kant W/o Shri Rikhiram Kant, aged about 32 years, at Pre Metric Anusuchit Jati Balak Chhatravas, Manikchouri, R/o village Chouha, Post Office Tikari, Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.).
6. Krishn Kumar S/o Gaukaran, aged about 30 years, at Pre Metric Anusuchit Jati Balak Chhatrawas, Bhattchoura, R/o village Khorsi, Post Tikari, Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

---Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of SC/ST Development Department, Mantralaya at D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).
2. The Secretary, CG State Anusuchit Jati Aayog, Raipur (C.G.).
3. The Collector, Office of Collector, Adivasi Vikas Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.).
4. The Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Bilaspur (C.G.).

---Respondents

For petitioners	:	Shri Awadh Tripathi, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer.

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

17/09/2018

1. The present Writ Petition was filed challenging the impugned order Annexure-P/1 dated 06/04/2011 which was a show cause notice issued to the petitioner alleging that the appointment obtained by the petitioner was a fraudulent appointment.
2. The present Writ Petition was filed as early as on 04/07/2011. The interim application which the petitioner had sought for stood rejected by this Court at the threshold itself.
3. Pending the petition, the respondents have come up with a reply stating that, the services of the petitioner subsequently has been terminated vide order dated 27/06/2011.
4. The said order of termination is not under challenge in the present Writ Petition, neither is there any application for amendment of the petition made in this regard.
5. In the given facts, the present Writ Petition in its present form is no longer sustainable and the same deserve to be and is accordingly rejected.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

Sumit