

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 5318 of 2020

1. P.K. Sonwani S/o Late Shri Dhiraji Sonwani Aged About 56 Years Posted As Chief Estate Officer, Chhattisgarh Housing Board Paryawas Bhawan, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Awasevam Paryavaran Vibhag, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Commissioner Chhattisgarh Housing Board, Head Office At Paryawas Bhawan North Block, Sector - 19, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Administrative Officer Chhattisgarh Housing Board, Head Officer At Paryawas Bhawan, North Block Sector - 19, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Mohd. Sirajuddin Sheikh Posted As Estate Officer, Chhattisgarh Housing Board, State Management, Moulshree Vihar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Smt. Naushina Ali, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Rahul Jha, Govt. Advocate.
For Respondents 2&3	:	Shri Harshmandar Rastogi under instructions of Shri Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

15.12.2020

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking for two main reliefs. One is for a direction to the respondents to decide the representation which the petitioner has made in respect of certain personal grievances that the petitioner has with the department and the approach that the department has shown towards the petitioner in connection with his style of discharging duties.
2. The contention of the petitioner is that the person who has subsequently been replaced by the petitioner has also been conducting in the same manner as was being done by the petitioner and the information of which has been obtained under the Right to Information Act. Keeping this in mind

the petitioner has made a detailed representation to the respondent No.2 which is pending consideration and a prayer has been made for an early decision of the same.

3. The second prayer of the petitioner is for deferring of the DPC which is likely to be conducted today or in the near future for promotion from the post of Estate Officer to that of the Chief Estate Officer under the respondents and where it is said that DPC is being convened only for respondent No.4 and the petitioner is senior to respondent No.4.
4. So far as relief No.1 is concerned, there does not seem to be any strong opposition by the respondents. Accordingly, as regards relief No.1 so far as decision on the representation is concerned, it is directed that the respondent No.2 shall take an appropriate decision on the representation Annexure P/7 that the petitioner has made at the earliest preferably within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order. As regards convening of DPC is concerned, this court is of the opinion that the outcome of that DPC would always be open to challenge by the aggrieved person by way of an appropriate fresh proceedings drawn.
5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge