

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 450 of 2021

1. Smt. Urmila Rathiya W/o Shri Lalcharan Rathiya Aged About 36 Years R/o Village And Post Jamarga, Dharamjaigarh, Tashil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat, Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh., District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat, Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh., District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
4. Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Jamarga, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh., District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. Yadavmani Kamalwanshi Technical Assistant Mahatma Gandhi NAREGA, Janpad Panchayat, Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh., District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Shukdev Prasad Sahu, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Wasim Miyan, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

15.02.2021.

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the issuance of an Advertisement dated 31.12.2020 (Annexure P-1) for appointment to the post of Gram Rojgar Sahayak for a period of one year on contractual basis.
2. According to the petitioner, he has been working on the said post of Gram Rojgar Sahayak since 2008 onwards and his appointment has been periodically renewed from time to time till 13.10.2020. According to the petitioner, since he has made certain complaints against the present Sarpanch they have decided not to continue with service of the petitioner

and have discontinued him and also have gone in for fresh advertisement vide Annexure P/1.

3. On a query being put to the counsel for the petitioner, he fairly concedes that the petitioner is also eligible for participating in the said recruitment process.
4. Given the said fact, the petitioner is entitled to participate in the said recruitment process for which an advertisement has been issued, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner calling for an interference with the impugned advertisement. Moreover, the services of the petitioner was purely contractual with no indefeasible right created in her favour.
5. The writ petition at this juncture stands rejected.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Jyotijha