

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 1524 of 2021

1. Nagendra Rathore S/o Shri Santosh Rathore Aged About 32 Years Resident Of Masturi, Post And Tahsil Masturi, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh. **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Directorate Of Public Instruction Chhattisgarh Raipur Indravati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh **---Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Shri Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate.
For State	:	Smt. Hamida Siddiqui, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

16.03.2021

1. The default pointed out by the Registry as of now stands ignored.
2. With the consent of the parties the matter is heard finally and disposed off.
3. According to the counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has participated in the recruitment process for the post of Lecturer (Chemistry) and the advertisement was issued by the Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board. The petitioner was found eligible and meritorious and was called in for verification of the documents after which also the petitioner was found meritorious and eligible in the recruitment process. However, when the final list was published, the name of the petitioner did not find place in the select list and the candidates who are less meritorious as compared to the petitioner, have been considered eligible for appointment. No reason whatsoever has been assigned as to why the petitioner has not been found eligible for the purpose of grant of appointment.

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already made a representation in this regard to the respondent No. 2 and prays that the respondent No. 2 be directed to decide his representation at the earliest so that if the petitioner has been erroneously left out, appropriate steps can be taken for remedial measure in this regard.
5. The said request is not opposed by the State Counsel.
6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent No. 2 to take a decision on the representation of the petitioner. It is expected that the respondent No. 2 shall intimate while passing the order to the petitioner as to why the petitioner has not been found eligible if at all the respondent No. 2 finds that the petitioner is not eligible for any reason that is available in records.
7. Let this exercise be completed by the respondent No. 2 within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
8. Meanwhile, the respondents should also ensure that, in case if the petitioner is found eligible and has been erroneously left out, steps should be taken promptly for further course of action. In addition, the petitioner would also be at liberty to file a fresh representation to the respondent No. 2 in addition to what he has already made.
9. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge