

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 4144 of 2021

1. Smt. Poonam Patel, W/o Shri Ramakant Patel, Aged About 39 Years R/o Quarter No.3236, Ward No.61, Shivam Vihar, Ravatpura Colony, Raipur, Police Station - Tikrapara, Tahsil And District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Its Secretary, Department of Tribal Welfare, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralay, Police Station And Post - Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Managing Director, C G State Antyavasyi Sahkari Vitta Avam Vikas Nigam, Tri Building, 2nd Floor, Sector-24, Atal Nagar, Police Station and Post - Rakhi, Nawa Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Antyavasyi Shakari Vikas Samiti Maryadit, Collector Office, Room No.34, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Manager, Antyavasyi Industrial Training Centre, Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University Premises, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
5. Babubhai Shriwas, Manager / Executive Officer, Office Of Zila Antyavyasi Sahkari Vikas Samiti, Kondagaon, District Kongagaon Chhattisgarh.
6. Laxmi Prasad Kashyap, Manager / Executive Officer, Office Of Zila Antyavyasi Sahkari Vikas Samiti, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Abhishek Pandey and Ms. Laxmin Kashyap, Advocates.
For State	:	Shri Amrito Das, Addl. Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

10.08.2021

1. The grievance of the petitioner seems to be supersession of the petitioner for promotion to the post of Manager/Executive Officer and the private respondents i.e. respondents No. No.5&6 who are both juniors to the petitioner being considered and granted promotion ahead of the petitioner.
2. According to the petitioner, on an enquiry she was informed that it is because of an adverse ACR that the petitioner could not be considered for promotion, however subsequent to her representing before the authorities concerned the adverse entry seems to have been expunged and her grading has also been upgraded. Further contention of the petitioner is that, now after her grading in the ACR having been upgraded, the

respondent authorities ought to have conducted a review DPC considering the petitioner for promotion along with the juniors who were promoted earlier.

3. Given the limited grievance that the petitioner has and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is substantively an employee working under the respondents No.2 to 4, the writ petition at this juncture stands disposed of directing the petitioner to prefer a fresh representation to the respondents No.2&3 supported with all relevant documents and records in support of her contentions. The respondents No.2&3 in turn shall consider and take appropriate decision taking into consideration the contentions that the petitioner shall raise in the representation. Let an appropriate decision be taken at the earliest preferably within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

4. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

inder