

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3463 of 2021

Deepti Shukla D/o Shri Shiv Kumar Shukla Aged About 32 Years R/o Aama
Talab Road Shardha Nagar Dhamtari District - Dhamtari Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through - The Secretary, Department Of School Education Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Director, Public Education, Directorate Of Public Education Indrawati Bhawan New Raipur District - Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The, Deputy Director, Public Education, Directorate Of Public Education Indrawati Bhawan New Raipur District - Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board Raipur Through Secretary Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. A. N. Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amrito Das, Additional AG
For Respondent No.4	:	Mr. Saurabh Kumar Pande, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

12/07/2021

1. The petitioner is aggrieved of the action on the part of the respondents in not issuing an order of appointment in her favour in spite of petitioner having been declared meritorious and was also subjected to document verification and also asked to furnish medical certificate which the petitioner again has complied with promptly.
2. It is a case where the petitioner had applied for the post of lecturer(Biology). The petitioner having participated in the recruitment

process was found meritorious for being selected to the post of Lecturer(Biology) both in the E-cadre as also in the T-Cadre. In the E-Cadre the petitioner was ranked as 388 and in the T-Cadre the petitioner was ranked at 367. The petitioner thereafter was called upon for counselling and document verification on 04.01.2021. The petitioner participated in the same and respondents thereafter vide Annexure P-6 directed the petitioner to produce the medical fitness certificate which again the petitioner immediately submitted to the respondents on 11.01.2021. However, thereafter when the posting order was issued vide order Annexure P-8, the name of the petitioner had not reflected in the same whereas candidates who were lower in the merit so far as ranking is concerned both in the E-Cadre as also in the T-Cadre found place in the select list and posting order subsequently issued vide Annexure P-8.

3. According to the petitioner, she has approached respondents by way of representation but till date it has not been decided and neither as petitioner been intimated as to why petitioner has been left out.
4. Given the aforesaid grievance that the petitioner has, particularly taking note of the fact that the reason why the petitioner has been left out is not either disclosed or not known to the petitioner as also the two counsels appearing for the respective respondents who are appearing on advance notice, this Court of the opinion that ends of justice would serve if as of now the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent no.2 to immediately consider the grievance of the petitioner and after due scrutiny take appropriate steps in as much as in case if the petitioner has been found to have erroneously been left out, appropriate remedial steps should be taken for issuance of posting order of the petitioner. In case, if the petitioner has been left out of the select list for some specific reason and

ground available, the petitioner should be immediately intimated about the same. The petitioner at this juncture would also be permitted to make a fresh representation in addition to any pending representation to the respondent no.2 within a period of seven days from today.

5. Subject to the petitioner making a fresh representation to respondent no.2, the respondent no.2 in turn shall take decision within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of representation of the petitioner in this regard.
6. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Rohit