

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WA No. 610 of 2018**

- Amresh Singh S/o Shri Banarshi Singh Aged About 45 Years Working On The Post Of Protection Officer (Non Institutional Care And Protection) Woman And Child Development Balrampur, District- Balarampur-Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Woman And Child Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Collector Women And Child Development Balrampur, District- Balarampur- Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.
3. District Porgram Officer Woman And Child Development, Balrampur, District- Balarampur, Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat Balrampur, District- Balarampur-Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.
5. Child Welfare Committee Through Its Members Balrampur, District- Balarampur- Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Appellant	:	Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Y.S. Thakur, Additional Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Prashant Kumar Mishra, Judge****Judgment on Board****Per, Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice****03.08.2018**

1. I.A. No.1 of 2018 is application for condonation of delay of 39 days in filing the appeal. For the reasons indicated in the said I.A. No.1 of 2018, the delay is condoned.
2. Writ application of the Petitioner was dismissed. The learned single refused to interfere with the order of termination of contract issued by the Collector, Woman and Child Development Department. Admitted position is that hiring of the Appellant was on contract and his services were not

found satisfactory for certain omission and commission by him, for which he was given an opportunity to explain. The contract was terminated thereafter.

3. Against such a decision taken by the Respondents, the appellant has common law remedies and application under Article 226 of the Constitution may not be the call of the day.
4. Dismissal, therefore, of the writ application refusing to interfere with such order by the learned Single Judge keeping in mind that it was a contract for employment and not of employment, no infirmity emerges from the impugned order dated 17.04.2018.
5. The appeal is dismissed. However dismissal of appeal will not come in the way of common law remedy if the Appellant decides to seek relief therein.

Sd/-
(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)
Judge