



2025:CGHC:16566
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.(S) No. 1152 of 2021

Vinayak Gupta, S/o Shri Rajesh Prasad Gupta, aged about 30 years, R/o Borodipa, Near Gupta Medical At Pussor (N.P.) Post Pussor, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Joint Director Department Of Directorate Panchayat Chhattisgarh Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Collector Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, Chhattisgarh

5 - Chandan Yadav S/o Umesh Yadav Working As Lecturer (Panchayat) And Posted At Govt. High School Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

6 - Lakhan Kumar Patel S/o Chaitram Patel Working As Lecturer (Panchayat) And Posted At Govt. High School Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Ishant Saluja, Advocate appeared on behalf of Shri Mateed Siddiqui, Advocate.
For Respondent Nos. 1 to 3/State	: Shri Vivek Siddharth Ojha, P.L.
For Respondent No. 4	: Shri Shobhit Koshta and Shri Rohan Shukla, Advocates.
For Respondent Nos. 5 & 6	: Shri C.J.K. Rao, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput

Order on Board

24/02/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking for the following relief :

- (i) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash /set-aside order dated 31.12.2018 (Annexure P-1) and stay order 25.07.2018 (Annexure P-6) also or to

give direction the respondent authorities to consider and grant petitioner for appointment on the post of Lecturer (Panchayat) on the basis of appointment order (Annexure P-1) of similar candidates respondent no. 5 and 6 within stipulated period, in the interest of justice;

(ii) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct respondent authorities to complete the proceeding for appointment immediately, in the interest of justice;

(iii) Any other relief which may be suitable in the facts and circumstances of the case, may also be granted.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent No.4 published in the advertisement inviting the application for appointment on the post of Lecturer (Panchayat) (Annexure P-2). The petitioner submitted his form and after the recruitment process was completed, a select list and waiting list was published. Merit list was prepared in which the petitioner is placed at Sl.No.14 (O.B.C category). He further submits that the appointment was given to respondent Nos. 5 & 6 and as per his information, the petitioner was placed in the waiting list No.1. According to the petitioner one of the selected candidates did not join her duties and therefore the vacancy which arose then should have been filled by granting an opportunity to the petitioner, thus the order passed by the respondents is bad in law. Thus, the respondents ought to have considered the case of the petitioner for appointment on the said post. Thus, this writ petition seeking the above stated relief as it has been filed.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that there is no interim order in this writ petition and the recruitment proceedings have already culminated by appointment of the eligible candidates. He further submits that the services of the 'Siksha Karmi's', has been absorbed with the State Government, thus, this writ petition has become infructuous.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to make the representation to the respondent No.4.
5. Learned counsel for the respondent No.4 vehemently opposes the above submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.
6. Return on behalf of respondent No.4 has been filed and it has been stated by learned counsel for the respondent No.4 that the recruitment process was of the year – 2018 and petitioner initially filed a writ petition bearing WPS No. 6861/2018 which was dismissed on 19.07.2019 by this Court. Thus, this writ petition itself is not maintainable.
7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record appended.
8. Be that as it may, taking into consideration the above stated facts of the case and also considering the recruitment process was of the year 2018 and the services of Siksha Karmi's have also been absorbed by the State Government earlier writ petition filed by the petitioner was also dismissed. This Court does not find any merit in this writ petition, is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge