

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5205 of 2019**

Smt. Satrupa @ Asha Bai Kanwar D/o Ramprasad Kanwar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Karma, Post Beltara, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

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

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Women And Child Development, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Director, Directorate Of Panchayat, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Commissioner, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Collector, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Bilha, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
6. The Project Officer, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Bilha, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
7. Smt. Anita Bai Sahu W/o Rajkumar Sahu, Village Karma, Post Beltara, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ajay Chandra, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. P. Acharya, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****16.07.2019**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition seems to be the appointment of

respondent no.7 as an Anganbadi Sahayika at village Karma, Janpad Panchayat Bilha, District Bilaspur.

2. The recruitment under challenge in the present dispute is of the year 2012. According to the petitioner, she has been wrongly denied appointment and favour has been shown granting appointment to respondent no.7.
3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had filed an appeal before the Collector which stood decided in her favour on 20.08.2014 and the appeal against which preferred by respondent no.7 also stood rejected vide order dated 30th September, 2015.
4. Perusal of the pleadings would show that respondent no.7 has thereafter preferred a revision before the Director, Panchayat and the revision is still pending.
5. Given the fact that as per the pleadings, the revision petition is still pending, this Court is of the opinion that it would not be proper for this Court to now venture into the issue when the matter is already seized before the revisional authority.
6. Considering the fact that respondent no.7 is working for the last 7 years in spite of there being two orders passed against her by the Collector as well as by the Commissioner, it would be proper if the respondent no.2 is directed to decide the revision at the earliest, if till date not decided, preferably within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order
7. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge