

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 7752 of 2018**

- Rajendra Pratap Singh S/o Shri S.P. Singh, Aged About 54 Years, Presently Working as Assistant Grade - I, Government Revtiraman Mishra, P.G. College, Surajpur, Tehsil and District Surajpur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Finance, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Director, Treasury, Account and Pension, Indrawati Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Joint Director, Treasury, Account and Pension, Indrawati Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Shobhit Koshta, Advocate
For State	:	Shri Dheeraj Wankhede, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****28.11.2018**

1. The present is the second round of litigation. The earlier round of litigation was disposed of vide order passed by this Court on 07.09.2018 in W.P.(S) No. 5863 of 2018 granting liberty to the petitioner to ventilate his grievance before the respondent authorities. The petitioner has subsequently made repeated representations Annexures-P/8 and P/9 dated 11.10.2018 and 27.10.2018 for re-considering the case of the petitioner for re-evaluation of the answer-sheet for the question No.3 in the examination conducted for the post of Assistant Account Officer/Deputy Treasury Officer by way of Chhattisgarh Adhinasth Lekha (Departmental) Exam, Part-II.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that on an earlier occasion i.e.

before the earlier writ petition was filed, the request for re-evaluation was rejected by the authority concerned expressing their inability to re-evaluate the answer-sheet of the petitioner. However, subsequently present writ petition has now been filed on the ground of one Seema Naik who was identically placed her claim for re-evaluation has been considered by the respondents and she was later found having passed the exam and she has also been granted promotion vide order dated 22.09.2018 (Annexure-P/7).

3. Given the said facts, the petitioner prays for a direction to the respondents to re-consider the case of the petitioner, particularly comparing the claim of the petitioner at par with the case of Seema Naik in whose case the department has accepted re-evaluation. He submits that when the respondents can permit re-evaluation in case of Seema Naik then the petitioner claim for re-evaluation also has to be permitted. The petitioner seems to have made out a strong case in this regard. Hence, the petitioner is again directed to make a fresh representation bringing the entire facts of the case to the notice of the higher authority in the department and also narrating the fact that the benefits which have been granted to the similarly placed person namely Seema Naik. The respondent No. 2 thereafter is directed to re-consider the case of the petitioner and pass a suitable order on merits at the earliest preferably within a period of sixty days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge