



2026:CGHC:13306

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 997 of 2021**

**1** - Narendra Kumar Sahu S/o Resham Lal Sahu Aged About 32 Years Posted  
As Technical Assistant At Janpad Panchayat Korba, District- Korba,  
Chhattisgarh., District : Korba, Chhattisgarh **... Petitioner**

**versus**

**1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Rehabilitation  
Rural, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh.,  
District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh  
**2** - Collector Korba, District- Korba, Chhattisgarh., District : Korba,  
Chhattisgarh  
**3** - Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat, Korba District- Korba,  
Chhattisgarh., District : Korba, Chhattisgarh **---- Respondents**

---

|                     |   |                                  |
|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For Petitioner      | : | None appears even in two rounds  |
| For State           | : | Mr. Amandeep Singh, Panel Lawyer |
| For respondent No.3 | : | Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, Advocate    |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey****Order on Board****19.03.2026**

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

**"10.1** That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow the petition and be pleased to make an order to set-aside the termination order, directing the respondent department to take the petitioner at the same post as Technical assistant and allow the salary to be given and also if necessary direct the respondent to keep one post vacant until the disposal of writ petition.

**10.2** That any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper together with cost of the petition."

2. It is stated that services of the petitioner, who was working on the



post of Technical Assistant on contractual basis were terminated after issuance of one month's prior notice, vide order dated 04.11.2020.

3. The decision was taken according to provision of Section 11(5) of the Chhattisgarh Civil Services (Contract Appointment) Rules, 2012 (for short 'the Rules of 2012').
4. The decision was taken by respondent No.3 in accordance with the Rules of 2012 and the order is not stigmatic, in my opinion, no case is made out for interference. Accordingly, this petition fails and is hereby **dismissed**.

**Sd/-**

**(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)**  
**Judge**

Rekha