

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 3948 OF 2018

Amitesh Yadu, S/o R.H. Yadu, aged about 38 years, R/o Satti Bazar, Near Raipur Convent School, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

2. The Director, Thakur Pyarelal Institute of Panchayat and Rural Development, Nimora, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vikash Dubey, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Ashutosh Pandey, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

18/06/2018

1. Grievance of the Petitioner is that the Petitioner who was engaged as a Computer Programmer on contract basis since 2009, has been ordered to be discontinued only on the ground that his ACR for the previous year was graded as 'Good' and it was not 'Very Good'.

2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner had immediately made an application for review of the ACR to the higher authorities and to his information the same has been reviewed and his grading has been upgraded from 'Good' to 'Very Good', but the same has not been communicated and in spite of efforts being made, copy of the same has not been served to him. He further submitted that a similarly situated person namely Suresh Singh Tomar was also identically placed and whose application subsequently has been allowed and he has also been granted extension of the contract but the same has not been given effect so far as the Petitioner is concerned. He further makes a submission that the Petitioner has made a detailed representation to Respondent No.2 and that his application is still pending consideration and thus he prays that the representation of the Petitioner be also objectively decided and the Petitioner be also given similar treatment as has been done in the case of the said similarly situated person.

3. The relief sought for by the Petitioner is not opposed by the learned State Counsel.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction that let Respondent No.2 take a decision on the representation made by the Petitioner within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and while deciding the representation, the authorities concerned shall also take into consideration the contentions raised by the Petitioner in his representation.

5. It is needless to mention that in case the service of the Petitioner has not been discontinued, he would be permitted to be continued till the decision is taken by Respondent No.2.

6. The writ petition stands disposed of with the above direction.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge