

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3171 of 2019

1. Pranita Rajput D/o Shri Gangaram Rajput Aged About 29 Years R/o Village Hathni Kala, Tehsil Pathariya, District- Mungeli, Chhattisgarh At Present Address- Qt. No. 38/1485, Sadar Police Line, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Revenue And Disaster Managment, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Tahsil And District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Collector District- Mungeli, Tehsil, Revenue And Civil District- Mungeli, Chhattisgarh

Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Rupesh Shrivastava, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order on Board

01/05/2019

1. The petitioner in the present Writ Petition had filled up online application form for appointment to the post of Patwari through the advertisement issued in the website of the Government in November, 2016. The petitioner's application was accepted by the department and she was also called for counselling, however, at the time of the counselling, the candidature of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that the certificate pertaining to her qualification was issued subsequent to the last date of filling up of the online application form.

2. The petitioner had appeared in the written examination conducted by the Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board and on successfully clearing the said examination, the petitioner was called for counselling.
3. The Counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case where the petitioner admittedly had appeared for the Post Graduate Diploma In Computer Application course from Dr. C.V. Raman University for the session Patwari in December 2016. The exam was also over and the result was declared, however the certificates were issued to the petitioner at later stage. Therefore, on the date when she had filled application, she was fully eligible and qualified for the receiving of the certificate from the university.
4. Further, the contention of the petitioner is that so far as identically placed persons in the other districts are concerned, they were scrutinized and also accepted by the department inasmuch as 9 candidates similarly placed have been selected. They had also received certificate alongwith the petitioner and some of the similarly placed persons received certificates even after the petitioner yet they have been selected for the said post, however, it is only the petitioner who has not been considered. The petitioner vide Annexure P-6 has produced as many as 9 certificates of similarly placed persons who have received certificates either along with the petitioner or subsequent to the petitioner and who have been selected. Therefore, it is prayed for a similar treatment extended to the petitioner also. The record shows that the petitioner has already made a representation in this regard to the respondent No. 02.

5. Given the aforesaid factual matrix of the case, this Court is of the opinion that ends of justice would meet if the petitioner is directed to make a fresh representation to the respondent No. 1 and 2 within a period of 15 days from today and on such representation being made, the respondent no. 1 and 2, who in turn shall decide the representation, keeping in view the fact, that the petitioner had already cleared the examination of the course in December, 2016 itself and similarly placed persons have also been selected in the other districts.
6. Let a decision be taken by respondent no. 1 and 2 within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge