

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 263 of 2019**

Lalita Sonwani S/o Amardev Sonwani Aged About 33 Years R/o Block - Semra, Kushmi, District - Balrampur Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur District - Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Collector Balrampur - Ramanujganj, District - Balrampur - Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat, Kushmi District - Balrampur - Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh
4. Santosh Kumar Singh S/o Shri Arjun Prasad Singh Aged About 30 Years Occupation - Rojgar Sahayak, Post At Gram Panchayat, Semra, Balrampur - Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh., District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Shri Raj Bahadur Singh, Advocate.
For State	:	Ms. Astha Shukla, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

16/01/2019

1. The limited challenge which the petitioner has made in the present writ petition is to the impugned order dated 22/03/2017 whereby the respondent No. 4 has been appointed as Rojgar Sahayak, at Gram Panchayat, Semra, Balrampur-Ramanujganj.
2. At the outset, this Court finds that the writ petition suffers from delay and laches, the substantive appointment initially given to the petitioner was on contractual basis and the contract was for a period of one year and which stood renewed from some time on annual basis. It is said that the services of the petitioner stood discontinued in the year 2017. Present writ petition is filed in January, 2019 that is after about two years of time from the discontinuance of his contractual employment. The present writ petition therefore in the opinion of this Court suffers from delay and laches and at this juncture the impugned order

Annexure (P-1) also cannot be questioned as the said appointment also was only till 28/02/2018 the period which has also since lapsed.

3. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed. However, the dismissal of the writ petition would not preclude the petitioner from approaching the authorities for ventilating his grievance on the administrative side.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

Rohit