

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 3700 of 2018**

Devendra Kumar S/o Shri Kirteshwar Lal, Aged About 31 Years
 Occupation- Service, District Project Manager, R/o Block 8F, Street
 No. 10, Section- 5, Bhilai Nagar, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat, New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Union of India, through the Under Secretary, Department of Panchayat, Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
3. The Collector, District Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat- Dhamtari, District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Laxmin Kashyap, Advocate
For Respondent No.2	:	Shri Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****24/07/2018**

Present petition has been filed challenging the impugned order Annexure P-1 dated 16.04.2018 whereby the representation preferred by the petitioner stood rejected.

2. The claim of the petitioner is that on an earlier occasion the petitioner had been discharging the duties of District Project Manager (contractual) for a considerable period of time which subsequently discontinued by the

respondents. Secondly, the respondents ought to have considered the case of the petitioner for being recruited in some other department in the State Govt.

3. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not have any strong case in his favour for the simple reason that the earlier engagement of the petitioner was that of a contractual employee. It is settled position of law that a contractual employee does not have any indefeasible right in his favour for being appointed in a department after conclusion of the contract.

4. So far as the petitioner being considered in the department is concerned, the observation in Annexure P-1 is quite specific, where the case of the petitioner was considered and he was found not eligible as he did not fulfill the minimum eligibility criteria fixed for those posts.

5. In view of the same, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner for interfering with the impugned order. The writ petition thus fails and is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**