

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 722 of 2020**

- Bhupendra Singh S/o Shri Gyane Singh Aged About 39 Years R/o G- 27 Near Rajbhawan, Pwd Colony, Civil Line, Raipur Chhattisgarh

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, General Administration Department , Mantralaya , Mahanadi Bhawan , Naya Raipur , Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission Through Its Secretary , Shankar Nagar Road , Raipur Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondents**

---

|                      |   |                                   |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | : | Shri Ishan Verma, Advocate        |
| For Respondent/State | : | Shri Amrito Das, Addl. AG         |
| For Respondent No.2  | : | Shri Ashish Shrivastava, Advocate |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**

**Order On Board**

**10/02/2020**

1. Heard.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner is an ex-service man and he participated in the recruitment process of 243 posts advertised by the State in the year 2018. The petitioner passed the preliminary examination and the main examination, thereafter, his documents were verified. In the interview the petitioner was deprived on the ground that he is not eligible for the reason that he has availed the benefit of ex-service man as the petitioner was appointed on the post of Revenue Inspector in the year 2015 under such privilege.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an ex-service man and will remain ex-service man for all the time as the logic and principle goes for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes candidates, therefore, the deprivation of the petitioner for recent recruitment process that he has availed the benefit of earlier ex-service man quota is bad in law and is completely illegal.
4. Learned counsel for the respondents oppose the arguments and would submit that the petitioner has already availed the benefit of ex-service man.
5. Reading of the entire facts would show and it is not in dispute that the petitioner has availed the benefit of ex-service man in the recruitment process and was appointed as Revenue Inspector in the year 2015. Once that benefit has been availed by the petitioner, the deprivation to the general person or any other ex-service man cannot be continued for time and again and for future and logically for all practical purposes the benefit having been availed once, it cannot be repeated subsequently it being a special privilege.
6. In view of the above I do not find any reason to admit this petition. It is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri  
Judge

Ashu