

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.5625 OF 2018**

Pushpalata Patel W/o Rajesh Kumar Patel Aged About 31 Years R/o Saliman Gali Madanpur, Kharsiya, Tahsil Kharsiya, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Development Commissioner Vikas Bhawan, Civil Line Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. District Programme Officer Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer District Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Kharsia, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.5627 OF 2018**

Ku. Sunita Bhoy D/o D/o Keshwari Lal Bhoy Aged About 27 Years R/o House No. 527, Kamla, Nagar, Beladula, Raigarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Development Commissioner Vikas Bhawan, Civil Line Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. District Programme Officer Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer District Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Baramkela, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
6. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Lailunga, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Shri CR Sahu, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Shri Raj Kumar Gupta, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****30.08.2018**

1. Challenge in both these petitions is to the order dated 04.06.2018 whereby the respondents have taken a decision not to extend the contractual employment of the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the decision of the respondents amounts to stigmatic order in as much as it reflects that the petitioner's service have not been extended on account of there being some adverse ACR which can adversely affect the future engagement of the petitioners in any further employment.
3. A perusal of record would show that it is not a case where there was adverse ACR communicated. It is a case where the respondents have only granted extension to only those persons who according to them were found suitable and the persons who were not found suitable, their contract was not renewed. This action of the respondents cannot be considered to be an adverse order so far as the career of the petitioners are concerned.
4. The law so far as contract employment is concerned, does not need much deliberation as it has been settled by a series of decision of the Supreme Court as also by this court wherein it has been held that a contract employee does not have indefeasible right beyond the contract period and the length of service would not be a factor while deciding the issue of discontinuance of contractual employment.
5. Needless to mention that discontinuance of the contract of the petitioners should not be taken detrimental to the future prospects of the petitioners so far as future employment is concerned.
6. Accordingly both the petitions being devoid of merit deserve to be and are dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge