

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 3187 OF 2015**

Ameer Ulla Khan S/o Sahdulla Khan, Aged About 30 Years R/o R.T.I. Colony, Quarter No. 1151, Vishrampur, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Surajpur, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Collector Tribal Development, Surajpur, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh.
4. The District Education Officer, Surajpur, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Shri DN Prajapati, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, PL.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

19.06.2018

1. The claim of the petitioner is in respect of not issuance of order of appointment on the post of Peon in favour of the petitioner.
2. The counsel for the petitioner submits that in the year, 2012, the respondents issued an advertisement for recruitment on the post of Peon. The petitioner being eligible and also having all requisite qualifications applied for the post and was called upon for written examination. The petitioner was selected in the written examination and was later on vide letter dated 10.07.2014 called for verification of his original marksheet along with other selected candidates.
3. The contention of the petitioner is that all other selected candidates who were called upon for verification of marksheet have been issued with the order of appointment but the petitioner has not been issued with the order of appointment on the ground that his marksheet could not be verified.

4. At this juncture, counsel for the State submits that photocopy of the marksheet which was produced by the petitioner for verification, on being verified, it was found that the School from where he has studied has since been closed and there was no record or proof available for verification and therefore he could not be issued with the order of appointment. He further submits that the petitioner was thereupon on various occasions called upon to submit original marksheet of Class-V so that after verification of the photocopy with the original, the appointment order could be issued to the petitioner.
5. The counsel for the petitioner submits that he had already produced the original marksheet before the respondents and he can still bring it to the notice of the respondents, if so desired.
6. Given the aforesaid submissions made by the State counsel and the counsel for the petitioner, this court is of the opinion that ends of justice would meet if the writ petition itself is disposed of with a direction that subject to petitioner's producing the original marksheet of Class-V before the respondents and on scrutiny of the same, the respondents would thereafter issue an order of appointment in his favour on the post of Peon. Let this exercise be done within a period of 45 days from the date the petitioner produces the original marksheet of Class-V.
7. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(P.Sam Koshy)
Judge