

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**W.P.S. NO. 5024 OF 2005**

- Devendra Kumar Sharma, S/o Shri Ramanand Sharma, age 52 years, District Auditor (Deptt. of Social Welfare), Joint Director, Panchayat & Social Welfare Department, Raipur, District Raipur (CG)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. State of Madhya Pradesh, through Secretary, Panchayat & Social Welfare Department, Government of M.P., Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)
2. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Chhattisgarh Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)
3. Commissioner, Panchayat & Social Welfare Directorate, Government of M.P. Shivajee Nagar, Bhopal (M.P.)
4. Commissioner, Panchayat & Social Welfare Directorate, Government of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)
5. R.C. Bansode, Joint Director, Panchayat & Social Welfare, Bilaspur (CG)
6. R.R. Aathiya, Joint Director, Panchayat & Social Welfare, Raipur (CG)
7. B.L. Dhruw, Joint Director, Director, Panchayat & Social Welfare, Mantralaya, Raipur (CG)
8. Milap Singh Patel, B.D.O., District Janjgeer, through- Deputy Director, Panchayat & Social Welfare, District Janjgir (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	None.
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****25/09/2018**

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the action on the part of the respondents in granting promotion to the juniors to the petitioner, i.e., respondents no. 5 to 8.
2. The respondents have filed reply to the writ petition stating that the respondents no. 5 to 7 have been granted promotion on the special drive conducted for promotion for reserved category and respondents no. 5 to 7 are the candidates belonging to reserved category. The name of respondent no.8 was included mistakenly by assuming that he belonged to the reserved category and therefore subsequently his appointment order has also been withdrawn.

3. Counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner herein belongs to general category and since there was no promotional process initiated for general category, the petitioner could not be granted promotion nor could the petitioner have any grievance on the promotion of the private respondents.

4. This being the factual matrix of the case it appears that the petitioner thereafter has lost interest in contesting the case after going through the reply filed by the State Government.

5. When the matter was called out twice there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

6. Under the circumstances, this Court is left with no other option but to dismiss the present writ petition for want of prosecution.

7. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

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