

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 686 of 2020**

- Satish Bhogal S/o Shri Devdas Bhogal Aged About 46 Years R/o AG/38, Kashiram Nagar (Purana), Telibandha, Ravigram Raipur, Thana Telibandha, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Comptroller And Auditor General Of India 9 Deendayal Upadhayay Marg, New Delhi - 110124
2. Accountant General (Audit) Baloda Bazar Road, Mandhar Raipur Post Office, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Rajesh Kumar Verma Multi Tasking Staff Through The Accountant General (Audit) Baloda Bazar Road, Mandhar Raipur, Post Office Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Hanawat Kumar Khobragade Multi Tasking Staff Through The Accountant General (Audit) Baloda Bazar Road, Mandhar Raipur, Post Office Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Alim Mohammad Multi Tasking Staff Through The Accountant General (Audit) Baloda Bazar Road, Mandhar Raipur, Post Office Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. Devendra Kumar Dhruw Multi Tasking Staff Through The Accountant General (Audit) Baloda Bazar Road, Mandhar Raipur, Post Office Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Girdhari Lal Verma, Advocate

For Respondent No.2 : Shri R.K. Gupta, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****10/02/2020**

1. Heard.
2. Challenge in this petition is to the order dated 23.07.2012 to cancel the panel of

the selected candidates.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has given the application in the year 2019 vide Annexure P-10. On specific query being made to the learned counsel for the petitioner that what is the relief he has sought for, the counsel repeatedly submitted that the client has submitted an application in the year 2019. Only to that extent the submission is made. It appears that neither the counsel is ready with the case nor in hold of any facts. Reading of the petition would show that the challenge in this petition is to the recruitment process of the year 2009. No reason is assigned as to why this enormous delay of 10 years has occurred. The submission of the counsel is as vague as it can be. Neither the delay has been properly explained nor the counsel is able to make submission as to what is the petition for.
4. Prima facie reading of the petition shows that the main challenge is to the selection which was made in the year 2009. Since no plausible explanation has been given to condone the delay, the petition suffers from gross delay and laches as the selection already made in the year 2009 cannot be re-opened as of now as no illegality prima-facie is on record.
5. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Ashu