Digitally
signed by
RAMESH
KUMAR VATTI

2025:CGHC:16824

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 3204 of 2021

- Rahul Giri Goswami S/o Manendra Giri Goswami Aged About 30 Years R/o C-4, Sector 3, Near Choupati, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Hire Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Directorate Of Higher Technical Education, Block-3, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Kusha Bhau Thakre Patrakarita Awam Jansanchaar Vishwavidyalaya, Through Its Registrar, Kathadih, Sunder Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Avinaash Kardekar, Through Registraar, Kusha Bhau Thakre Patrakarita Awam Jansanchaar Vishwavidyalaya, Kathadih, Sunder Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. Chandra Sekhar Shivhare Through Registraar, Kusha Bhau Thakre Patrakarita Awam Jansanchaar Vishwavidyalaya Kathadih, Sunder Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	None appeared even in two round
For Respondents No. 1 to 3	:	Mr. Vedant Shadangi, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No. 4	:	Mr. Sandeep Pandey, Advocate holding the brief of Mr. Vikram Sharma, Advocate
For Respondent No. 5 & 6	:	Ms. Annu Mishra, Advocate holding the brief of Mr. Malay Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Order on Board

09/04/2025

1. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking the following relief(s):-

> "**10.1** That the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ in nature of Quo Warranto to the Respondents to remove Respondent no. 5 and 6 from the post of Stenographer along with recovery of whole amount paid to them as salary till disposal of the case.
>
> **10.2** Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem and proper in the present circumstances of the case."

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 02.04.2025, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner. It appears that the petitioner has lost his interest in pursuing the matter, therefore, this Court is left with no other option except to dismiss the petition for want of prosecution.

3. Accordingly, the petition is **dismissed** for want of prosecution.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
Judge

vatti