

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 129 of 2019

1. Daharu Ram Sonkar S/o Shri Tulsi Ram Sonkar Aged About 30 Years Guest Faculty (Economics) At Govt. College Bhakhara District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh, Presently R/o Choube Bandha Post Baroda, Tahsil Rajim District- Gariyabad, Chhattisgarh.
2. Tomesh Markandey S/o Panch Ram Markandey Aged About 29 Years Guest Faculty (Zoology) At Govt. College Bhakhara District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh. Presently R/o Village Kondapara, Post Kondapara, Tahsil Kurod, District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
3. Dr. Payal Sahu S/o Shri Jeevan Lal Sahu Aged About 31 Years Guest Faculty (Geography) At Govt. College Bhakhara District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh, Presently R/o Village Bohara Post Sanod Tahsil Guru District- Balod, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Additional Director Director, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Commissioner Higher Education Department, Block C-3, 2nd And 3rd Floor, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Principal Govt. P.G. College Bhakhara, District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Chandradeep Prasad, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

10/01/2019

1. The [petitioners](#) in the present writ petition is aggrieved by the decision of the State Govt. dated 09.10.2018 Annexure P/1 whereby the State Govt., as a precautionary measure, has directed the concerned Principals of the Govt. Colleges not to appoint any Guest Faculty in respect of those subjects where in previous years the arrangement was being made by way of Guest Faculty.

2. The instruction so issued by the State Govt. appears to be in the light of some directions given by this Court in a couple of writ petitions, the leading of which being WPS No. 4938/2018 and other analogous matters which came up for hearing before this Court and where this Court had granted interim relief on 31.07.2018.
3. According to the petitioners, they had already been granted appointment and by virtue of appointment, they are still discharging their duties. Contention of the counsel for the petitioners is that the college in which the petitioners are working and also the subject which the petitioners are teaching, there is no litigation in as much as there is no writ petition against the said college and also against the subject in which the petitioners are teaching. It is the further contention of the petitioners that the order Annexure P/1 dated 09.10.2018 is only an order passed by the department to avoid a situation of contempt of Court. According to the petitioners, the contempt of Court would arise only in the event of there being a specific direction or a writ issued against a particular college or against a particular subject which in the instant case does not exist.
4. This fact is not disputed by the State counsel.
5. Given the said facts and also taking note of the directions given by this Court vide order dated 31.07.2018 in the bunch of writ petitions, it is evidently clear that this Court had granted interim protection to only those specific petitioners who had approached the High Court and the interim protection also was confined to the subject against which each of the petitioners were working. This Court in the subsequent series of litigation of similar nature had specifically mentioned that the recruitment process, if any, would be permitted to be continued except for filling up those posts where there is a claim by the previous academic sessions' guest faculties

and the said interim order would come into force only in the event of the posts are lying vacant and it has not been filled up before the interim orders were passed by this Court.

6. Given the aforesaid facts, this Court is of the opinion that the services of the **petitioners** since have not been questioned in any other writ petition and that the **petitioners are** still by virtue of appointment granted **to them** continuing in service, **their services** should not be discontinued.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved