

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 8788 of 2019

Jagjeet Singh S/o Budhram, Aged About 35 Years Caste Mar, R/o
Village Murka, Tahsil Shankargarh, Police Station Shankargarh,
District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
--- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Panchayat and Gramin Vikas Vibhag, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector, Balrampur Ramanujganj, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Shankargarh, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Balrampur Ramanujganj, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh. -- **Respondents**

For the Petitioner : Mr. A.K. Yadav, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Kunal Das, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

23-10-2019

1. The grievance of the petitioner is that in the year 2017 he was appointed as *Rojgar Sahayak* in Gram Panchayat, Murka, Janpad Panchayat Shankargarh, District Balrampur Ramanujganj by the Chief Executive Officer and by impugned order dated 12.06.2019 (Annexure P-1), the service of the petitioner has been terminated on the ground that the documents i.e., residential certificate, domicile certificates were not in accordance with law.
2. It is argued that the contract appointment was continuing for a period of one year for each succeeding year, however, the same

has been terminated without affording any opportunity of hearing or issuing show cause notice, therefore, the same is illegal and arbitrary being violation of the principles of natural justice enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, would submit that the petitioner was a contract appointee, therefore, if any complaint was made against him and he was found to have committed irregularities and dereliction in duties, the order of termination is fully justified.
4. Bare perusal of the impugned order of termination would manifest that the petitioner has been terminated with immediate effect. The order does not refer to any show cause notice or enquiry, wherein, the petitioner was allowed to participate. It is *per se* in violation of the principles of natural justice, which is clearly established from the language of the order of termination itself, therefore, for the reason that no order adverse to an individual be passed without following the principles of natural justice, as held by the Supreme Court in the matter of **State of Punjab & Ors. v. Senior Vocational Staff Masters Association & Ors. (AIR 2017 SC 4072)**, the impugned order Annexure P-1 deserves to be and is hereby quashed at the admission stage itself. However, liberty is reserved in favour of the competent authority to take appropriate action after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner or to take decision about continuation of the petitioner's services at the end of completion of the period of contract appointment.
5. It is also made clear that the observations made in the preceding paragraphs of this order shall not be construed in favour of either parties and any action or proceeding initiated against the

petitioner, after issuance of show cause notice against him, shall be decided strictly in accordance with its own merits and law.

6. This writ petition accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-

**GOUTAM BHADURI
JUDGE**

R a o