



2026:CGHC:12988

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 314 of 2022

Suresh Kumar Sahu S/o Lakhani Lal Sahu, Aged About 24 Years R/o House No. 196 Dewangan Para P.S. Mujhgahan, Tahsil Abhanpur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Animal Husbandry And Medical Sciences, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - The Joint Director, Department Of Veterinary Medical Services Near Mandi Gate Pandry, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - The Chairman Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board Of Vyapam Bhawan, North Block Sector 19 Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh Pin Code 492001, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

4 - Akash Verma S/o Shri Chandra Shekhar Verma, Presently Working As Assistant Veterinary Medical Officer At Veterinary Hospital Tilda, Block Tilda, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

5 - Ku. Yoshika Dewangan (Deleted) As Per The Hon'ble Court Order Dated 19-01-2022

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	: Ms. Kusum Lalchandani, Advocate, holding the brief of Mr. Akath Kumar
-----------------------	---

	Yadav, Advocate
For Respondents No.1 & 2	: Mr. Rishabh Deo Singh, P. L.
For Respondent No.3	: Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate, holding the brief of Dr. Saurabh Pande, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Judgment on Board

18/03/2026

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

"10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for entire records pertaining to the case of the petitioner.

10.2 That this Hon'ble court may be pleased to set-aside the impugned order dated 03.11.2021 in respect of respondent no.4 and no.5 passed by the respondent (ANNEXURE P/1). no. 2

10.3 That this Hon'ble court may further be pleased to pass in favour of the petitioner to reserve one OBC category of post in supernumerary nature.

10.4 That this Hon'ble Court may further be pleased to pass the appointment order for the petitioner on the post of Assistant Veterinary Medical Officer

10.5 That this Hon'ble court may further be pleased to pass any order/writs which is deemed to be suitable in the favour of the petitioner."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that pursuant to an advertisement dated 16.08.2021, the petitioner applied for the post of Assistant Veterinary Medical Officer as a member of Other Backward Caste Classes (for short, OBC) and submitted application form along

with relevant documents on 27.08.2021. She would contend that though the name of the petitioner was included in the list of candidates, but his name was not considered under the OBC category; thus, she submits that the action of the respondent authorities is illegal, arbitrary, and mala fide.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that a copy of the application form submitted by the petitioner is annexed as Annexure R/1. It is contended that the petitioner did not annex the social status certificate along with the application form, therefore, he was treated as an unreserved category candidate, and his name was reflected accordingly. It is further contended that objections were invited, but the petitioner failed to submit the relevant documents or raise any objection before the competent authority. It is also submitted that the advertisement was issued for contractual appointments for a fixed period, which has already expired; thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents.
5. Admittedly, the advertisement was issued on 16.08.2021. From perusal of the application form, it is evident that the social status certificate was not submitted along with the application form by the petitioner. The petitioner was therefore treated as an unreserved category candidate.

6. Objections were invited; but the petitioner failed to appear before the selection committee and did not place the relevant documents. Further, the appointment was purely on a contractual basis for a period of one year, which has already been expired.
7. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, in my opinion, no direction can be issued to the authorities to consider the claim of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE

Nadim