

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 2029 of 2019

Smt. Nandini Patel W/o Shri Madan Lal Patel, Aged About 40 Years,
Working As Mitantin, R/o Village Tundra, Post- Tundra, Block- Kasdol,
District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Health And Family Welfare, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Deputy Director, National Health Mission, Chhattisgarh C.G. Grih Nirman Mandal, Vyavasahik Parisar, 4th Floor (South East Corner), Sector-27, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.- 492015
3. The Director Of Health Services, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Medical And Health Officer, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh
5. The Chief Medical And Health Officer, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. The Collector, Balodabazar, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Pramod Shrivastava, Advocate
For State/Respondents 1, 3 to 6:	:	Mr. P. Acharya, P.L.
For Respondent no.2	:	Mr. C. Jayant K. Rao, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

29/03/2019

1. The dispute raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition is to the selection process of Staff Nurse under the Chief Medical and Health Officer, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara dated 10.09.2018.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that though she has been found eligible for the said post but the department has not granted marks for the experience that she has, on account of which, the merit of the petitioner would substantially have got improved.
3. At this juncture, counsel for respondent no.2 submits that it is only the preliminary stage where the petitioner has been declared eligible and the petitioner along with other eligible candidates are yet to undergo the entire selection process. He submits that the petitioner would be given marks for experience as has been decided by the Selection Committee and she would be given similar treatment as would be given to all selected candidates and only thereafter a final select list would be published.
4. In view of the submission made by the counsel for respondent no.2, this Court is of the opinion that nothing further remains to be adjudicated upon in the present writ petition. Accordingly, expecting the respondent no.2 to act fairly by giving equal treatment to each of the selected candidates and also by abiding to all the conditions stipulated in the advertisement, the final select list would be published, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge