

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 4760 of 2018**

Suman Tirkey D/o Kompal Tirkey, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village
Sewari, Tehsil Rajpur, District Balrampur Ramanujganj, Police
Station Rajpur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Urban Administration And
Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya, Naya
Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Joint Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department,
Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Collector , District Balrampur – Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh
4. Commissioner, Nagar Palika Nigam Rajpur, District Balrampur –
Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Panchayat Rajpur, District Balrampur
Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh
6. Chief Executive Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Rajpur, District Balrampur
Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh
7. Registrar, Sarguja Vishwavidyalaya Ambikapur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri V. R. Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Astha Shukla, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****25/07/2018**

The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that she
had applied for the post of Lecturer (Nagriya Nikay) for commerce subject
and participated in the recruitment process and she was also found eligible

for the said post. However, at the time of first counseling which was held on 31.01.2018 she was declared ineligible on the ground that she could not produce M.Com mark sheet which according to the petitioner she had cleared M.Com before participating in the recruitment process itself.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that as the petitioner had not obtained marksheet from the Department, she could not produce the same and therefore, the authority concerned should have granted her sometime for producing the same. He submits that the respondents are now proceeding to conduct the subsequent counseling, therefore, her claim may be considered in the second counseling as she has now obtained M.Com marksheet. He further submits that the petitioner has already preferred a representation to the authority in the department on 15.06.2018 which till date has not been decided and prays for the writ petition to be disposed of with a direction to respondent no.6 to decide the representation of the petitioner.

3. Counsel appearing for the State does not have any objection to the prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of with a direction that respondent no.6 shall consider the case of the petitioner and the representation which she has made. In addition, the petitioner would be at liberty to file a fresh representation before respondent no.6 along with copy of the order passed by this Court and such representation being made, the same shall be decided at the earliest preferably before the second counseling is conducted by the respondents.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE