

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WA No. 123 of 2019**

1. Chowaram Tandekar S/o Late Shri Bharat Lal Tandekar Aged About 35 Years Occupation Lecturer Mechanical, Government Polytechnic College, Kanker, Distt. Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
2. Hemlal Sahu S/o Shri Atam Ram Sahu Aged About 36 Years Occupation Service, Lecturer Mechanical, Government Polytechnic College, Kanker, Distt. Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
3. Amit Soni S/o Shri Lakhan Lal Soni Aged About 35 Years Occupation Service, Lecturer Mechanical, Government Polytechnic College, Khairagarh District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

---- Appellants**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Technical Education, Man Power And Planning, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Hemlal Sahu S/o Shri Atma Ram Sahu Aged About 36 Years Occupation Service, Lecturer Mechanical, Government Polytechnic College, Kanker, Distt. Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
3. Amit Soni S/o Shri Lakhan Lal Soni Aged About 35 Years Occupation Service, Lecturer Mechanical, Government Polytechnic College, Khairagarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Director Directorate Of Technical Education, Raipur, Indrawati Bhawan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
5. The Director Directorate Of Technical Education, Raipur, Indrawati Bhawan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
6. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary, Shankar Nagar Road, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
7. The Government Polytechnic College, Kanker, Throuth Its Principal Chhattisgarh.
8. The Government Polytechnic College Khairagarh, Distt. Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh Through Its Principal.

---- Respondents

For Appellant	:	Shri Rahul Tamaskar, Advocate.
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Gagan Tiwari, Deputy Government Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Judgment on Board

Per Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice

19.02.2019

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. We have perused I.A. No. 1 of 2019, which is an application for condonation of delay. Since it does not provide any cogent and valid reason for condonation of delay when there is delay of 657 days, we are not inclined to condone it.
3. The submission of the counsel for the Appellants is that since their case is similarly placed, that by itself may not be a good ground for condoning such delay, especially when they do not belong to the category of a daily wager or a Class IV employee. They are said to be Assistant Workshop Superintendents working in the Polytechnic College in the State.
4. I.A. No. 1 of 2019 is rejected. This appeal is dismissed on the ground of delay itself.

Sd/-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge