CGHC010437102026 2026:CGHC:46903

NAFR

JYOTI SHARMA
Digitally signed by JYOTI SHARMA
Date: 2026.11.05 16:14:33 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7984 of 2026

Manoj Kumar S/o. Ram Prasad Aged About 32 Years R/o. Village Churela, Bhatgoan District Sarangarh Bilaigarh C.G.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Health And Family Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur C.G.

2. Commissioner Cum Director Directorate Of Health Services C.G., Indrawati Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.)

3. Chief Medical And Health Officer (Cmho) Balodabazar Bhatapara, Distt. Balodabazar Bhatapara (C.G.)

4. Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board, Through Examination Controller, Vyapam Bhawan, North Block, Sector-19, Atal Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

5. Krishna Kumar Kamde S/o. Deepak Kumar Kamde Aged About 38 Years Through Chief Medical And Health Officer (Cmho) Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Distt. Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.) @ Serial No 9 In Annexure P/1,

6. Sunil Kumar Sahu S/o. Girdhari Lal Sahu Aged About 34 Years Through Chief Medical And Health Officer (Cmho) Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Distt. Balodabazar-Bhatapara, (C.G.) @ Serial No 14 In Annexure P/1,

7. Pikeshwar Kumar S/o. Bhagwat Ram Aged About 38 Years Through Chief Medical And Health Officer (Cmho) Balodabazar-Bhatapara Distt. Balodabazar Bhatapara (C.G.) @ Serial No 15 In Annexure P/1,

8. Tikeshwar Kumar Sahu S/o. Bhagtu Ram Aged About 36 Years Through Chief Medical And Health Officer (Cmho) Balodabazar-

Bhatapara, Distt. Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.) @ Serial No 17 In Annexure P/1,

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Aman Pandey, Advocate
For Respondent/ State	:	Mr. Y.S. Thakur, Addl. A.G. along with Ms. Vertika Shrivastava, P.L.
For Respondent No. 4	:	Mr. Arpit Parakh on behalf of Mr. Animesh Tiwari, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

05.11.2026

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition has been filed questioning the grant of additional 10 bonus marks to the private respondents in the direct recruitment process for the post of Rural Health Coordinator (Male), pursuant to the advertisement dated 16.06.2025. It is contended that, in terms of the State Government circular dated 07.12.2021, 10 bonus marks were admissible only to those health workers who were specifically appointed to discharge duties during the COVID-19 pandemic and had rendered continuous service for a period of six months. However, the respondent authorities have extended the said benefit to candidates who were appointed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, which is contrary to the aforesaid circular and, therefore, illegal.

2. Per contra, learned State counsel, along with learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 4, submits that the circular dated 07.12.2021 provides for the grant of additional 10 bonus marks to employees who have rendered continuous service for a period of

six months during the COVID-19 pandemic, without making any distinction between employees appointed prior to or during the pandemic. It is, therefore, contended that the private respondents No. 5 to 8, having rendered continuous service for the requisite period during the COVID-19 pandemic, have rightly been awarded the said bonus marks. It is further submitted that the grant of such marks is also in consonance with the order dated 01.05.2026 passed by this Court in WPS No. 635 of 2026, wherein directions were issued for extending the benefit of additional 10 bonus marks to contractual employees also who had worked in Government health institutions/centres during the COVID-19 pandemic.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

4. Upon consideration of the rival submissions and upon perusal of the circular dated 07.12.2021 issued by the State Government, it appears that the benefit of additional 10 bonus marks is admissible to employees who have rendered continuous service for a period of six months during the COVID-19 pandemic. The circular does not make any distinction between employees appointed prior to the commencement of the pandemic and those appointed during the pandemic, provided they have fulfilled the prescribed eligibility criteria by rendering continuous service for the requisite period during the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore,

the private respondents, having fulfilled the aforesaid eligibility criteria, cannot be said to have been wrongly extended the benefit of 10 bonus marks. Further, the action of the respondent authorities is also in conformity with the directions issued by this Court vide order dated 01.05.2026 passed in WPS No. 635 of 2026.

5. In view of the aforesaid, this Court finds no illegality or infirmity in the grant of additional 10 bonus marks to the private respondents warranting interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is **dismissed** at the motion stage itself.

Sd/-

(Bibhu Datta Guru)
JUDGE

Jyoti