

NAFR

HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.2090 of 2018**

Gouri Dewangan D/o Suresh Dewangan Aged About 24 Years R/o
House No. 4, Shanti Nagar, Bijapur, District Bijapur Chhattisgarh.

----Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Welfare, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Commission, Through Its Commissioner, Indravati Bhawan, Block - li, 2nd Floor, Naya Raipur, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Commissioner, Bastar Division, Jagdalpur Chhattisgarh.
4. Collector, Bijapur, District Bijapur Chhattisgarh.
5. Zila Panchayat, Bijapur, Through Its Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Bijapur, District Bijapur Chhattisgarh.
6. Ku. Sonam Sahu, D/o Bhanwarlal Sahu, R/o Village Kodebod, Tahsil Kurud, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Malay Shrivastava, Advocate.
For respondent-State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****14.03.2018.**

1. The petitioner challenges the order dated 11.01.2018 (Annexure P/1) whereby the respondent No.6 has been appointed on the post of Technical Assistant on contract basis in the Bastar Division.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that, the advertisement in this regard was specific so far as the appointment to be made for Bastar and Surguja Division are concerned that local residents of said Districts would only be considered for appointment on the said post. However, the respondent No.6, the selected candidate, is not from the said district as is reflected from the order dated 11.01.2018

(Annexure P/1) where her address is shown to be that of District Dhamtari (CG). An objection in this regard was also raised by the petitioner before the respondent No.4, but no action has been initiated. Later on, the respondent No.2, Commissioner, Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Commission, has also written a letter on 29.01.2018 to the respondents No.4 & 5 to look into the objection raised by the petitioner and to take an appropriate action, yet there is no further development on the said letter of the Commissioner dated 29.01.2018.

3. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping this petition pending. Rather, ends of justice would meet if this petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents No.4&5 to consider the objection of the petitioner and after inquiry take suitable action in accordance with law within a period of 45 days from the date of production of certified copy of this order before the respondents No.4 & 5. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to provide the certified copy of this order to respondents No.4&5.
4. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.
5. It is made clear that this court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall pass an appropriate order purely in accordance with law on its own merits.

Sd/-
(P.Sam Koshy)
Judge