

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.5592 OF 2018**

1. Ku. Archana Sahu D/o Late Shri Vishnu Prasad Sahu Aged About 48 Years R/o House No. 4/1617, Beside Vandana Auto, Ramkund Para, Near Vivekanand Ashram, G.E. Road, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

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

1. Union Of India Through The Secretary, Department Of Telecommunication, Doordarshan Bhawan, Sansad Marg, New Delhi (India), District : New Delhi, Delhi
2. Director Prasar Bharti, Directorate General Doordarshan, Copernicus Marg, New Delhi-1, District : New Delhi, Delhi
3. Broadcast Engineering Consultants India Limited Project Office B-15, Sector-3, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, District : Noida, Uttar Pradesh
4. Pradeep Kumar Shrivastava Programme Chief, Doordarshan Kendra, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Shri HB Agrawal, Sr. Advocate along with Smt. Preeti Yadav, Advocate.
For Respondent-UOI	:	Shri B. Gopa Kumar, Assistant Solicitor General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****29.08.2018**

1. The petitioner in this petition has challenged his discontinuance alleging it to be a malafide termination order.
2. A perusal of records particularly the order of appointment and other documents enclosed in the writ petition clearly reflects that engagement of the petitioner was purely contractual and that the petitioner has been discontinued only after the contractual period has expired.
3. It is now well settled proposition of law that contractual employees do not have any indefeasible right for continuity in employment

beyond the contract period. Though the counsel for the petitioner tried to emphasize on the fact that the petitioner's service had been extended from time to time and in the process she has been working for a period of more than 10 years, this by itself would not again give any right in favour of the petitioner as each time the contract period was renewed for a further period of one year. Renew of contract period or extension to be granted is well within the domain and realm of the respondents. It is for the respondents to take a decision whether they require services of the petitioner or not.

4. Under the circumstances, this court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner calling for interference with the order Annexures P/6 or P/8. However, right of the petitioner to approach the authorities by making a suitable representation or getting her in employment in case if there is availability of work as of now or at a later stage is reserved.
5. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy
Judge