

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WA No. 462 of 2018**

Manjay Kumar Yadav S/o Bhikhari Ram Yadav, Aged About 29 Years R/o PWD Tiraha, Ward No. 22 Manendragarh, District Koriya, Chhattisgarh.

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector, Collectorate, Baikunthpur, District Koriya, Chhattisgarh.
3. Additional Collector, Baikunthpur, District Koriya, Chhattisgarh.
4. Tahsildar, Manendragarh, District Koriya Chhattisgarh.
5. Narayan Sarkar, S/o Satya Bhushan Sarkar, R/o Ahmad Colony, Near Rojgar Karyalay Manendragarh, District Koriya Chhahtisgarh.
6. Shiv Kumar Sahu, S/o Late Chaitram, R/o Bus Stand Kali, Mandir, Manendragarh, District Koriya, Chhattisgarh.
7. Narendra Kumar Yadav, S/o Late Mangal Sai Yadav, R/o Khadgawa, District Koriya Chhattisarh.

---- Respondents

For Appellant	: Shri Rajnish Singh Baghel, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Government Advocate.
For Respondents No.6 & 7	: Shri J.K. Gupta, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Judgment on Board**24/09/2018****Per Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**

1. Heard counsel for the parties.
2. Appeal is against the order dated 27.03.2018 passed by the learned Single Judge where the Appellant's writ application came to be dismissed when the learned Single Judge refused to interfere with the order of removal of the Appellant on completion of his period of contract for such engagement.

3. Submission of learned counsel for the Appellant is that his removal was based on a stigma and that one set of contractual employee ought not to be replaced by another contractual employee.
4. The admitted position that hiring of the Appellant was on contract. No doubt, it was extended from time to time, but that does, not give him indefensible right to continue in service or that termination of contract would require some kind of exercise for removal of a permanent employee.
5. The learned Single Judge therefore rightly dismissed the writ application as there was no merit, but he has also taken note of that the Appellant's removal or discontinuance may not be treated as a stigma in any manner.
6. Be that as it may, there is no infirmity in the order of the learned Single Judge, which requires any interference in appeal.
7. The appeal has no merit. It is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE