

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**Writ Petition (S) No. 5046 of 2021**

1. Panna Lal Sonwanshi S/o Bachche Lal Sonwanshi Aged About 33 Years  
R/o Chandaha/Banshipur Janpad Panchayat Sonhat District Koriya  
Chhattisgarh.

**---Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Panchayat,  
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Nawa Raipur District Raipur  
Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Directorate, Panchayat Department Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar  
Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Collector Koriya Distict Koriya Chhattisgarh.
4. District Programme Officer Rozgar Gaurantee Rozgar Yozna District  
Koriya Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Koriya District Koriya Chhattisgarh
6. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Koriya District Koriya  
Chhattisgarh

**---Respondents**

|                |   |                                 |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Shri Kaushal Yadav, Advocate.   |
| For State      | : | Shri Ishan Verma, Panel Lawyer. |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**21.09.2021.**

1. The petitioner is aggrieved of the order Annexure P/1 dated 15.06.2017.  
Vide the said order, the services of the petitioner has been discontinued on  
completion of the contractual engagement.
2. At the outset, this court is of the opinion that the writ petition suffers from  
delay laches for the reasons that the impugned order was one which was  
issued more than 4 years back. No justifiable reasons have been assigned  
by the petitioner for not approaching the court within a reasonable period  
of time. Moreover, admittedly the appointment of the petitioner was on  
contractual basis and the period of contract already stands expired and the  
services were not extended by the impugned order. It is now more than

four years time that the petitioner has been out of employment and there was no challenge to the order of discontinuation.

3. Given the said facts, the writ petition thus suffers from delay laches. The same deserves to be and is hereby rejected. Reluctance of this court in entertaining the writ petition would not preclude the petitioner to approach the respondents in case of availability of work and also if the respondents intend to engage the services of the petitioner, or any other similar persons.

Sd/-  
(P. Sam Koshy)  
**Judge**

inder