

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 8085 of 2018**

Arun Kumar Pathak S/o Late Ramesh Prasad Pathak Aged About 43 Years
 Village - Dhangawan, Post Sadhwani District Bilaspur Pin 495117
 Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of General Administration, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Shankar Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Exam Controller Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Shankar Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Petitioner in person	:	Shri Arun Kumar Pathak, Advocate
For State	:	Shri R. N. Pusty, GA
For Res. No.2	:	Ms. Sharmila Singhai, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****10/12/2018**

1. The only relief sought for in the present writ petition is for direction to the respondents to produce the entire records pertaining to the selection process and the impugned result. Further relief sought for is for constituting an expert body to get the model answers as well as answer sheets of the reevaluation.
2. Perusal of the record would show that the recruitment process in which the petitioner had participated was the State Service Examination of the year 2016. The results of the said examination was published in December, 2017. The present writ petition has been now filed after about more than eleven months that is on 28/11/2018. The grounds raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition is that the valuation

part has not been properly done and he had not been timely evaluated in respect of the results which ultimately he has obtained only under RTI recently though the results were published in December, 2017 and only then the present writ petition had been filed.

3. Perusal of the records though, the result were published in December, 2017 the petitioner had applied under RTI for the details of the answer Sheet only on 17/08/2018. By this time the entire recruitment process had already been completed and the selected candidates were also given appointments.

4. Given the facts and the circumstances of the case, it would be futile exercise now to reopen the entire recruitment process by getting answer sheet of the petitioner reevaluated and also the reevaluation of the model answer. Moreover, the rules also do not provide or prescribe any such procedure.

5. Given the facts, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition at this juncture, the writ petition thus fails and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge