

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 6090 of 2018**

Smt. Devkunvar Verma W/o Shri Visheshar Prasad Verma, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village And Post Tandwa, Tahsil Tilda, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of School Education, Secretariat, Mahanadi Bhawan, P.S. And Post Rakhi, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Director, Public Instructions, Office Of Directorate Of Public Instructions Chhattisgarh, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The District Education Officer Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri S. A. Ansari, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri S. P. Kale, Dy. Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****17/09/2018**

The claim of the petitioner in the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondents for issuing an order of reappointment in favour of the petitioner in terms of an order dated 28.06.2008 Annexure P-5.

2. At the outset, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition on the ground that the petition suffers from inordinate delay and laches. The petitioner was initially engaged as an Assistant Teacher way back in the year 1982-83 on ad hoc basis. Subsequently, the services of the petitioner stood discontinued in the year 1983. Thereafter, the petitioner was out of

service till date. This by itself means that the petitioner had been out of employment for a period of 35 years by now. In between, the petitioner has except for making an averment of periodically visiting the authorities by making representations, no efforts has been seriously made by the petitioner for getting reappointment under the respondents. Meanwhile, many of the similarly placed persons had also knocked the door of the Court even then the petitioner has not approached the Court for reasons best known to her. Today, the petitioner has reached the age of about 57-58 years. At this belated stage, it would not serve any fruitful purpose for issuance of a direction to the respondents for an order of reappointment in favour of the petitioner.

3. The writ petition, on the ground of delay and laches, deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge**