

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Appeal No. 426 of 2020

**(Arising out of order dated 02.09.2020 passed by the learned Single Judge
in W.P.(S) No. 3494 of 2020)**

- Pt. Ravi Shankar Shukla University Through Its, Registrar, Pt. Ravi Shankar Shukla University, Amanaka, G.E. Road, P.S. Sarswati Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh Pin 492001 (the Title as Registrar (Administrative), Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur Chhattisgarh Wrongly Pleaded By The Petitioners in The Writ Petition)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Dr. Ranu Agrawal D/o Late Shri Kamal Kishore Agrawal aged about 38 Years Working As Guest Faculty (Economics) at S.O.S. In Economics, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur Chhattisgarh,
2. Uday Adhau S/o Shri Prakash Adhau aged about 28 Years Working As Guest Faculty (History) At S. O. S. In Law, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Sudeep Sarwan S/o Kumar Sahu aged about 38 Years Working As Guest Faculty (Law) at S. O. S. In Law, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur Chhattisgarh,
4. Hemant Kumar Nandagauri S/o Shri Rajendra Nandagauri aged about 28 Years Working as Guest Faculty (Law) At S. O. S. In Law, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Dilip Kumar Soni S/o Shri Kailash Soni Aged About 39 Years Working As Guest Faculty (Law) at S. O. S. In Law, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University, Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary of Higher Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
7. Additional Director Directorate of Higher Education Department, Atal Nagar, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Appellant : Mr. Neeraj Choubey, Advocate.

For Respondents/State : Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, Deputy Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per, P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice

20.11.2020

1. Heard Mr. Neeraj Choubey, the learned counsel appearing for the Appellant/University as well as Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, the learned Deputy Advocate General representing the State.

2. The grievance of the Appellant is that the verdict passed by the learned Single Judge was at the admission stage and without granting opportunity of hearing to the University. It is also pointed out that the factual position has been given in distorted manner in the writ petition; which led to the judgment, whereby some directions have been issued which stands detrimental to the rights and interest of the University. The learned counsel submits that the matter requires consideration in view of the actual facts and figures and hence the appeal.
3. Mr. Chandresh Shrivastava, the learned counsel representing the State also submits that the matter was disposed of at the admission stage and that representation was there only on behalf of the Respondents No. 1 & 2. Infact, the alleged employer, as far as the writ petitioners are concerned, is the University and as such, it is for the University to bring up the actual facts and figures before the Court. If the verdict has been obtained by the Petitioners without revealing or suppressing the actual facts and figures and if the directions stand against the University in any manner, it is open for the University to pursue appropriate remedy before the learned Single Judge, before pursuing the matter by way of appeal.
4. The learned counsel for the Appellant seeks for permission to withdraw the matter without prejudice to the rights and liberties to pursue appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

5. The permission is granted.
6. The matter is dismissed as withdrawn accordingly.

Sd/-
(P.R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Chandra