

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S)No.3016 of 2018**

Vikas Kumar Kashyap S/o Vishram Kashyap Aged About 26 Years R/o Main Road, Karhayapara Ward No. 14, Ratanpur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department, D Block 4th Floor, Indravati Bhawan New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Director, Department Of Urban Administration, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Chief Nagar Palika Officer, Nagar Palika Parishad Dipka District- Korba, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Shakti Raj Sinha, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, Govt. Advocate

SB: Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****08/05/2018**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is the fresh recruitment process which has been initiated by the respondents for filling up the post of Revenue Inspector.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that he had participated in the recruitment that was advertised in the year, 2013 and thereafter the respondents have not finalized the said recruitment process. The contention of the petitioner is that the petitioner was also found meritorious in the said recruitment process and he was also subjected to interview, but thereafter the respondents have not acted upon the said recruitment process and now have issued a fresh advertisement altogether.

3. The State counsel were directed to seek instructions in this regard as to what happened in respect of recruitment initiated in the year, 2013.
4. Today, the State counsel makes a submission that he has received instructions inasmuch the respondents having principally decided not to proceed with the recruitment process initiated in the year, 2013 and since much time also, in between have been consumed, they have now initiated steps for a fresh recruitment altogether. The State counsel submits that there is no formal communication or an order in this regard, but he has received positive instruction in this regard of the earlier recruitment process being dropped.
5. The petitioner has only an objection to the extent that even if the respondents have principally decided not to proceed further with the earlier recruitment process, there ought to had been an order dropping the entire recruitment process.
6. Once when the State counsel on instruction makes a submission that the process stands dropped, this court is of the opinion that nothing further remains to be done.
7. The petitioner would also be at liberty to participate in the fresh recruitment process, if he so desire subject to his being also eligible.
8. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge