

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 9133 of 2019**

- Bimlesh Kumar Kanwar, S/o Shri Narayan Singh Kanwar, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village - Rigwar, Post - Pudoo, Thana And Tahsil - Kota, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Mantralaya, New Raipur , Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. The Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat Bilaspur , District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Collector Bilaspur , District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
4. The Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board Raipur , District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.
5. Sunil Kumar Paikara S/o Shri Man Singh Paikara, Aged About 25 Years R/o Village - Chureli, Post - Kenda, Thana And Tahsil - Belgahana, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Bharat Rajput, Advocate
For Respondents/ State	:	Ms. Richa Shukla, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****19/11/2019**

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though the petitioner was in the select list at Serial No. 7 and 8 posts were to be absorbed for the post of

lecturer English, his selection was given a go by and instead a waiting list candidate namely Sunil Kumar Paikara (Respondent No. 5) was selected. The selection was made in the year 2017. It is contended that the petitioner thereafter made several correspondence to correct the fact but the same has not been adhered to. Therefore, at this stage, the respondents may be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner.

2. If the contention of the petitioner is accepted that though he was selected and placed in Serial No. 7 and 8 posts were to be absorbed for the post of lecturer English then in such case subject to exception, the selection of the petitioner cannot be given a go by if the wrong has been committed, it cannot be perpetuated. Under the circumstances, since the selection of the petitioner is of the year 2017, therefore, the selected candidate (Respondent No. 5) is also required to be heard when the representation of the petitioner is decided. Therefore, respondent No. 1 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within a further period of 6 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and while hearing so the respondent No. 5 (Sunil Kumar Paikara) shall also be heard and thereafter considering all the facts the necessary orders may be passed.
3. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge