

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 10391 of 2019**

- Padman Lal Choudhary S/o Shri Tularam Choudhary Aged About 50 Years Shikshak L.B. Shaskiya Purv Madhayamik Shala Savitaripur Nivasi Gram Savitaripur Vikaskhand Pithoura Thana Pithoura Jila Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Sachiv, School Shiksha Vibhag, Chhattisgarh Sasan, Naya Raipur, Jila Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Sanchalak Lok Shikshan Sanchanalaya Chhattisgarh Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur Jila Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Collector Avam Jila Mishan Sanchalak Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mishan Mahasamund Jila Mahasamund Chhattisgarh
4. Jila Shiksha Adhikari Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mishan Samgra Shiksha Prabhag / Karyalaya Jila Shiksha Adhikari Mahasamund Jila Mahasamund Chhattisgarh
5. Vikas Khand Shiksha Adhikari Pithoura, Jila Mahasamund Chhattisgarh
6. Jila Priyोजना Adhikari Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mishan Mahasamund Jila Mahasamund Chhattisgarh
7. Anshuman Pratik Chandu Sahayak Shikshak Panchayat Prathamik Shala Bhajpuri Vikaskhand Pithoura Jila Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Abdul Wahab Khan, Advocate

For Respondents/State : Shri Kunal Das, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****10/12/2019**

1. Heard.
2. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that by order dated 01.10.2019, the

petitioner was appointed as a Co-ordinator in the Sankul Kendra Savitripur, Block Pithoura for the reason that one Anshuman Prateek Chandu Respondent No.7 could not discharge his job properly. It is further contended that thereafter by order dated 28.11.2019 (Annexure P-2) the petitioner was directed to join back his previous place of posting and respondent No.7 was reappointed. It is contended that this reappointment of respondent No.7 is against the policy of the State (Annexure P-3) as in order to appoint the co-ordinator a person should be a trained teacher and should have been a teacher of middle school.

3. I have perused the documents. Perusal of documents shows that the petitioner by order dated 01.10.2019 (Annexure P-1) was appointed, he was given the charge of work of co-ordinator and subsequently. If original person is again been asked to resume his duties i.e. the respondent No.7, I do not find any substantial right which has accrued in favour of the petitioner which can be adjudicated by way of this petition. The petitioner apparently appears to be given the charge and the charge having been taken back by giving it back to respondent No.7, it would be within the domain of the administrative exigency and discharge of job. This Court cannot dictate order direct a particular job to be discharged by a particular person so as to interfere in the administration of a particular office in a supervisory capacity.

4. The petition has no merit, it is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge