

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 5267 of 2021**

Shyam Sundar Agrawal S/o Ramnarayan Agrawal Aged About 38 Years
Resident Of Near Brahmadev Mandir, Sahupara, Gudiyari, Raipur , District
Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of School Education Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Directorate Of Chhattisgarh Public Instruction, Indravati Bhawan, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector And District Magistrate Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
5. District Education Officer Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
6. Vishesh Chhabra S/o Sushil Chhabra Resident Of Shristi Samridhhi Colony, Near Lcit College, Raipur Road, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
7. Khushboo Singh D/o Ramesh Kumar Singh Resident Of Saktipara, Gouravpath, Baloda Bazar , District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.
8. Bhagyashree Mishra D/o S.P. Mishra Resident Of 89/5 , Nehru Nagar , East Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh.
9. Vishal Thakkar S/o Navinkant Thakkar Resident Of Ews 204, Sec. 03 Devendra Nagar, Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
10. Karishma Sahu D/o Virendra Kumar Resident Of Biroda, Post And Block Abhanpur, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

11. Mayank Luniya S/o Prakash Luniya Resident Of Flat No. 308, B-Block Samta Premises, New Rajendra Nagar, Near Rishabh Residency Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Patel, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amit Buxy, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

29/09/2021

1. The petitioner seems to be aggrieved of the appointment of the respondent No.11 to the post of Lecturer (Commerce English) for Swami Atmanand English Medium Excellent School, Raipur.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that inspite of the fact that the petitioner has scored more marks in the written examination, the private respondents have been found suitable and eligible, but the petitioner has been deprived of his right.
3. The State counsel points out that the selection process consists of three stages, one was that of the written examination and second is the comparison of the educational qualification of each of the candidates and third being the marks allotted in the interview. Clubbed all three together whoever scores the maximum would be the selected candidate. This aspect is not being reflected in the writ petition.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he has already approached the Department under the Right to Information Act for obtaining this information.

5. Given the said facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petition at this juncture disposed of permitting the petitioner to approach the Court in case if he finds any disparity or discrimination shown to him after obtaining the information under the Right to Information Act.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved