

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPS No. 2622 of 2010**

1. Anita Bai, W/o Shri Dhaniram, aged about 38 years, Caste Mahar, R/o Village Mujgahan, Post Pinkapat, P.S. Devri, Tehsil Daundi Lohara, District Durg (CG)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Gramin Vikash, Mantralaya, DKS Bhawan, Raipur (CG)
2. Collector, Durg, District Durg (CG)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Daundilohara, District Durg (CG)
4. Project Officer, Ekikrat Bal Vikash Pariyojana, Daundi Lohara, District Durg (CG)
5. Mahila Bal and Swasthya Sthayi Samiti, through Head of Samiti, Daundi Lohara, District Durg (CG)
6. Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Mujgahan, Block Daundi Lohara, District Durg (CG)
7. Deokala Sinha, widow of late Chhagan Lal, R/o Mujgahan, Block Daundi Lohara, District Durg (CG)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	: Shri Samarth Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Ms. Madhunisha Singh, Panel Lawyer.
For Respondent No.7	: Shri BP Singh, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****05/12/2019 :**

1. Respondent No.7 Deokala Sinha was appointed to the post of Aangan Badi Worker of Gram Panchayat, Mujgahan, Block Dondilohara, District Durg on 28.1.1997. She was removed from the said post on 4.2.2007 against which she preferred Writ Petition No.697/2004, which was allowed vide order dated 31.3.2010 quashing the order of termination/removal. Respondent No.7 joined on the post and consequently the petitioner's appointment was cancelled.
2. Since the petitioner was appointed during the period respondent No.7 stood removed from the post and her writ petition was pending, she preferred the present writ petition challenging cancellation of her appointment.
3. The petitioner and respondent No.7 are claiming appointment on the same post of Aangan Badi Worker of Gram Panchayat Mujgahan, therefore, once a writ has already been issued by this Court in Writ Petition No.697/2004, a contrary writ cannot be issued by another coordinate Bench. The appropriate remedy for the petitioner lies in either moving Review Application or Writ Appeal, if any such proceeding is maintainable in law.
4. The present writ petition cannot be entertained to pass order which would in effect run contrary to the earlier writ issued by this Court.
5. The writ petition stands disposed of subject however to the above observations. Consequently, interim order passed earlier is vacated.

Sd/-
Judge
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)