

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 4580 of 2021**

1. Ashutosh Shindey S/o Shri R. P. Shindey Aged About 46 Years R/o RG-7, Rajaswa Colony, Tahsil And District Korba Chhattisgarh Working As Assistant Grade-III, Deposition Writer District And Session Court Korba District Korba Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Finance, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Office Of District And Session Judge Korba District Korba Chhattisgarh
3. The Joint Director Treasury, Pension And Accounts, Office Of Directorate Bilaspur Division Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Ajaya Barik along with Shri Vikas Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Shri Ayaz Naved, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****01.09.2021**

1. The present writ petition has been filed assailing the order dated 05.03.2011 and 28.05.2011 collectively marked as Annexure P/1.
2. Perusal of the pleadings would show that the petitioner on the earlier instance has already approached this Court for the same relief, vide WP(S) No. 3453 of 2019. This Court was not inclined to entertain the said writ petition, when it came up for admission at that point of time. Therefore, the petitioner on 08.05.2019 withdrew the writ petition with liberty to approach the authorities on the administrative side for

ventilating his grievances. For ready reference the order dated 08.05.2019 passed in WP(S) No. 3453 of 2019 is being reproduced here-in-under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw this petition with liberty to approach the authorities on the administrative side.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.”

3. It appears that the petitioner thereafter has approached the authorities concerned and according to the petitioner, no decision as such has been taken by the respondent-authorities which has led to the filing of the present writ petition.
4. All said and done, when this Court was not inclined to entertain the writ petition at the first instance in the year 2019 for the same grievance and the for the same relief, the second writ petition again would not be maintainable. The liberty which was granted to the petitioner for ventilating his grievance on the administrative sides still holds good and the petitioner would be at liberty to avail the same, if he so wants.
5. The writ petition therefore being not maintainable, deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-

**P. Sam Koshy
Judge**

J-