

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 2110 of 2020**

Social Organization For Community Health (SOCH) Dongargarh,
 President Milan Tembhurkar S/o Late Gaurang Tembhurkar, Aged
 About 45 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 09, Bhim Nagar Ambedkar
 Ward, Dongargarh, Post, Tahsil And Police Station Dongargarh, District
 Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Chief Secretary, Mahanadi Bhawan,
Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director, Directorate Of Women And Child Development Department,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
4. The District Program Officer, Women And Child Development
Department, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Love Kumar Ramteke, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Sudeep Verma, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****25.09.2020**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order Annexure P-1
 passed by the respondent no.4 asking the respondent no.2 to take an
 appropriate decision so far as the appointment of the petitioner as a
 service provider under the Women and Child Development Department

is concerned.

2. Bare perusal of Annexure P-1 would reveal that the same is a correspondence made by the District Programme Officer to the Director of the Department and the decision is yet to be taken by the Director.
3. Counsel for the petitioner, at this juncture, submits that the action has been initiated by the respondent no.4 perhaps on the ground that the petitioner has not opened offices at Khairagarh, Chhuikhadan and Chhuria blocks in district Rajnandgaon. According to the petitioner, they have been specifically appointed as service provider for Dongargarh where they have their establishment. In addition, they are taking care of the aforesaid 3 blocks from their office at Dongargarh. However, the respondents were insisting that the petitioner should also have their office at these blocks. According to the petitioner, their reluctance to open offices at these blocks is only for the reason that the respondents have not made any commitment for releasing of any extra fund for opening office at these blocks and subject to the respondents providing necessary funds, the petitioner would also open office at these blocks.
4. Be that as it may, since Annexure P-1 is a correspondence made to the respondent no.2, this Court is of the opinion that let the grievances of the petitioner be brought to the notice of the respondent no.2 by allowing the petitioner to make a detailed representation to the respondent no.2 who in turn shall consider the representation of the petitioner on its own merits and thereafter shall take an appropriate decision on Annexure P-1. The respondent no.2 shall take a decision

purely in accordance with the rules and guidelines governing the field and also taking into consideration the merits of the case.

5. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**