

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 3649 OF 2018**

1. Gaurav Prajapati S/o Shri B.R. Prajapati, Aged About 31 Years R/o Q.No. P-H/3, Irrigation Colony, Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh.
2. Prabhat Seth, S/o Shri Arun Gupta, Aged About 30 Years R/o H.No. 825, Nandni Nagar, Gariyabandh, District Gariyabandh.
3. Neeraj Kumar, S/o Shri Narendra Kumar, Aged About 31 Years R/o Hig- li/75, Sector-4, Pt. D.D.U. Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Mines, Mantralay, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Through Its Chairman, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Ms.Supriya Upasne, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, G.A.
For Respondent No.2	:	Shri YS Sharma, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****14.05.2018**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the instant case is non inclusion of qualification of Master of Science in Petroleum Geology as one of the qualification for the post of Assistant Geologist. The petitioners also want the recruitment process now initiated by the respondent vide advertisement dated 21.04.2018 inviting applications for the post of Assistant Geologist be kept in abeyance and also the said qualification of Petroleum Geology be added as one of the qualification for the said post.
2. This court is of the view that the grievance raised by the petitioners is not one which could be taken into consideration under the scope of judicial review of this court. It is settled position of law that prescribing of the minimum qualification and the eligibility criteria is a

the field which is essential within the domain of the State Govt.. It is the power exclusively of the State Govt. to decide the minimum eligibility criteria and the qualifications for a particular post. This court in exercise of writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India would not be in a position to issue a mandamus in this regard.

3. Admittedly the petitioners have already made a representation in this regard which is collectively marked as Ex.P/5. There appears to be no progress on the said representation, it is for the State to consider and decide the said representation.
4. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge