

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 4414 of 2018**

Kuldeep Singh S/o Shri Greesh Chandra Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Jamul Ravanbhata, Bhilai, Po - Jamul, District And Tahsil Durg Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Union of India Through The Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, North Block, New Delhi, Delhi NCR.
2. The Deputy Inspector General (EST RECTT) D.T.E. Gen. ITBP Police, Block II, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi, Delhi NCR.
3. Inspector General (East) Frontier, ITBP, Home Ministry, Government Of India, Sheela Complex, Vidhan Sabha Marg, Near Radio Station, Hazratganj, Lucknow, District Lucknow U.P.
4. The Commandant, 14 BN, ITBP Pithoragarh, District Pithoragarh (Uttarakhand).

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Shantam Awasthi, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	:	Mr. Rajkumar Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****06/07/2018**

1. The petitioner had applied for the post of Constable (GD) in the I.T.B.P. On the scrutiny of the applications, the petitioner was found eligible and he was expecting an order of appointment in his favour. Later on it is learnt that the order of appointment issued in favour of the petitioner could not be served upon him as is alleged by the petitioner and inspite of the repeated reminders by the respondents, since the petitioner did not report for the duty, his appointment has been cancelled.
2. Thereafter the petitioner filed an objection before the authorities intimating that he has never been served with the order of appointment and that he was ever willing to join the duties, provided

an order of appointment would have been served upon him. This application was considered by the respondents i.e. the respondent No.2, the petitioner was intimated that his application dated 07.11.2017 is still under consideration and the petitioner would be intimated in respect of the further development on the said application. Thereafter the petitioner has not been communicated of any further development. This fact is not in dispute as is evident from Annexure P/6 dated 13.11.2017 filed by the petitioner.

3. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court does not intend to keep the petition pending rather ends of justice would serve if the respondent No.2 is directed to take a decision as per Annexure P/6 dated 13.11.2017 on the application/objection filed by the petitioner on 07.11.2017.
4. Let this exercise be done at the earliest preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of the order of this Court.
5. It shall be duty of the petitioner to ensure that the order passed by this Court is brought to the notice of respondent No.2.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge