

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 4121 of 2019**

Sohan Lal Dahariya S/o Shri Shyam Lal Dahariya, Aged About 58 Years,  
Presently Working As Sub Engineer In The Office Of P.W. D. Division  
Champa R/o Shanti Parisar, Kera Raod, Nearby Nahar Bridge Janjgir,  
District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Public Works Department  
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur,  
Chhattisgarh
2. Engineer In Chief, Public Works Department, Nirman Bhawan, Raipur  
District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Engineer, Public Works Department Bilaspur, District Bilaspur  
Chhattisgarh
4. Superintendent Engineer, P.W.D. Department, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur  
Chhattisgarh
5. Executive Engineer, Public Works Department, Champa Division District  
Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondents**


---

|                |   |                               |
|----------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Mr. Kishore Narayan, Advocate |
| For State      | : | Mr. Samir Behar, P.L.         |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy****Order on Board****17.06.2019**

1. The claim of the petitioner in the present writ petition is for calculating  
seniority of the petitioner on the post of Sub Engineer since 1993 onwards

when he was initially appointed.

2. Facts of the case are that the petitioner, in the year 1993, was offered the post of Tracer. The petitioner accepted the offer and joined the service and continued to work on the said post. In due course of time, he was promoted to the post of Sub Engineer on 14.02.2008.
3. Contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that the other similarly placed persons were appointed on the post of Sub Engineer whereas the petitioner was granted appointment on the post of Tracer which was contrary to the recruitment which was conducted at that point of time and the petitioner therefore should be considered to be a Sub Engineer from 1993 onwards.
4. This Court, on perusal of the record, finds it difficult to accept the argument of the counsel for the petitioner for the simple reason that the present writ petition has been filed in 2019. The petitioner was initially appointed in December, 1993. The petitioner thereafter got promotion on the post of Sub Engineer in 2008. From 1993 to 2008 the petitioner was not aggrieved of his appointment as a Tracer. Further, from 2008 to 2019 the petitioner was not aggrieved of his promotion on the post of Sub Engineer. The petitioner having accepted the offer of appointment in the year 1993 with wide open eyes, at this juncture, he cannot turn around and question the appointment order that was issued 16 years back.
5. The writ petition thus being devoid of merit deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-  
(P. Sam Koshy)  
JUDGE**