

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No.786 of 2014

Dr. Akhilesh Tiwari S/o Shri R.P.Tiwari Aged About 42 Years R/o A-3,
Sri Ram Parisar, Shanti Nagar, Bilaspur, Distt Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Dks Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, Distt Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. District Mission Director Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Collectorate, Bilaspur, Distt Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. District Project Director, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Jila Panchayat, Bilaspur, Distt Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. District Project Coordinator, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Jila Panchayat, Bilaspur, Distt Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat, Bilaspur, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
6. Neeraj Kumar Bansod Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat, Bilaspur, Distt Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For petitioner	:	Shri Amrito Das, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Adhiraj Surana, Dy. G.A.
For respondents 2 to 5	:	Ms. Pushpa Dwivedi on behalf of Shri AS Kachhwaha, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

23/04/2018

1. Challenge in the present writ petition is the order of suspension dated 06.02.2014.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that subsequently pending the present petition, the order of suspension has been revoked by the respondents vide order dated 30.09.2014 which further stood modified on 29.11.2014 pursuant to which the petitioner is still working at the place from where he was placed under suspension.
3. Given the aforesaid submissions made by the counsel for the

petitioner, this court is of the opinion that since the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed, the petition has become infructuous. The petition deserves to be and is hereby dismissed as having become infructuous.

4. It is made clear that by virtue of modification made by the State Govt. on 29.11.2014, the petitioner seems to have been continuously working at Bilaspur, needless to mention that the order dated 30.09.2014 now would not be pressed upon by the respondents. However, it would be open for the respondents to pass an appropriate orders in the event of administrative exigency so far as posting of the petitioner is concerned.
5. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P.Sam Koshy)
Judge