

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No 8249 of 2018**

Smt. Meena Sahu W/o Shri Krishna Kumar Sahu Aged About 38 Years  
R/o Village Banahil Gram Panchayat Pachari, Post Farsadih, P. S. And  
Tahsil Bilaigarh, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Mahila Avam Bal Vikash Department Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector Baloda Bazar District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Baloda Bazar District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Bilaigarh, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
6. Project Officer Janpad Panchayat Bilaigarh, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
7. Heera D/o. Chheduram Aged About 23 Years Working As Gram Rajgar Sahayak, And Posted At Gram Panchayat Pachari, Post Pawani, Tahsil Bilaigarh, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

**----Respondents**

|                |   |                                 |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Mr. U.P.S. Sahu, Advocate       |
| For State      | : | Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, P.L. |

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

1. The substantial grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is to the appointment given to the respondent No.7 on the post of Gram Rojgar Sahayak, at Gram Panchayat, Pachari, Post Pawani, Tahsil Bilaigarh, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara.
2. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent No.7 has been wrongly granted the said appointment, though she was not eligible for the same and that the petitioner was more meritorious than the respondent No.7.

3. Perusal of the record would show that the petitioner has straight away filed the present writ petition without availing the alternative remedy under the statute to the higher authorities in the department. Record further shows that there are a couple of representations, which the petitioner has made to the different authorities of the respondents.
4. Given the said facts and circumstances of the case, since the petitioner has already raised an objection/representation before the respondents No.3 & 4, this Court is of the opinion that let the respondents No.3 & 4 scrutinize the case of the petitioner in accordance with its merit and pass an appropriate order at the earliest preferably within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of the copy of this order. The said representation made by the petitioner may be treated as an appeal or an objection against the appointment and necessary orders be passed.
5. In addition, the petitioner would also be free to file a fresh representation/objection/appeal to the respondents No. 3 & 4 ventilating his grievances, which if filed, would also be taken up for consideration by the authorities.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed off.

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

Ved