



2026:CGHC:10096

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1141 of 2024

- Pramesh Kumar Patel S/o Shri G.S. Patel Aged About 47 Years Block Resource Coordinator Block Dabhara, District : Sakti, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary To The Govt. Of Chhattisgarh, Department Of School Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, Naya Raipur, P.S. Rakhi, Raipur C.G.
2. Collector-Cum-District Mission Coordinator Janjgir Champa, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector Sakti, District : Sakti, Chhattisgarh
4. Shri Jhadu Ram Ratre Head Master, Govt. Middle School Ghoghari, Block Malkharouda, District : Sakti, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	: Mr. Anurag Dayal Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondent-State	: Mr. Virendra Verma, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No. 2	: Ms. Akanksha Jain, Advocate
For Respondent No. 4	: Ms. Hamida Siddiqui, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD

26/02/2026

1. Petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking following reliefs.

“10.1 To quash the order dated 05.02.2024, Annexure P-1 with direction to allow the petitioner to work as Block Resource Coordinator.

10.2 Any other relief, which the Hon'ble Court considers proper under the circumstances of the case, may kindly be awarded.”

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner was posted as Block Resource Coordinator vide order dated 11.08.2021 issued by the Collector-cum-District Mission Director, Rajeev Gandhi Siksha Mission, Janjgir, District



Janjgir-Champa. District Janjgir-Champa was reorganized and new district Sakti was carved out w.e.f. 08.09.2022, however, the Collector Janjgir-Champa was still working as Mission Director of territorial jurisdiction of Sakti district also. On the date of passing of order Annexur P-1 dated 05.02.2024, territorial jurisdiction of district Sakti under Rajeev Gandhi Siksha Mission was under the control of Collector-cum-District Mission Director, Rajeev Gandhi Siksha Mission, Janjgir and therefore the Collector, Sakti was not having jurisdiction to pass order of repatriation of petitioner to work on the substantive post. He submits that if petitioner working as Block Resource Coordinator is to be withdrawn then appropriate orders has to be passed by the competent authority.

3. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 submits that as the Collector is ex-officio Mission Director under Rajeev Gandhi Siksha Mission (now Samagra Siksha Mission) therefore she will also represent Respondent No. 3. She submits that in argument and pleadings made for grounds raised in writ petition, no supporting documents have been placed in record.
4. Learned counsel for Respondent No. 4 submits that pursuant to the order Annexure P-1, Respondent No. 4 is also working as Block Resource Coordinator at Block Dabhra, District Sakti.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. Perusal of ordersheet dated 22.02.2024 would show that when this case came up for hearing for the first time this Court considering the grounds raised in the petition as also submissions of the counsel for respective parties therein passed interim order of stay of effect and operation of Annexure P-1 dated 05.02.2024 and by virtue of the said order, according to the submission of learned counsel for petitioner, petitioner is still working as Block Resource Coordinator, Block Dabhra, District Sakti.
7. Ld. counsel for respondents No. 2 & 3 has not placed any document before this Court to controvert the submission of learned counsel for petitioner and



pleadings in writ petition that on the date of passing impugned order, Collector, Janjgir-Champa was working as Mission Director for the district Sakti also.

8. In the above facts of the case, considering entire facts and circumstances of the case and further that to show that the Collector, Sakti is having authority to work in the capacity of District Mission Director under Samagra Siksha Abhiyan on the date of passing of order dated 05.02.2024, no document is placed before this Court along with reply filed by Respondent No. 2, I am of the opinion that instead of keeping this writ petition pending before this Court, to allow this writ petition and quash order Annexure P-1 reserving liberty with the respondents to pass an order afresh in accordance with law.
9. Accordingly, writ petition is **allowed** and the order Annexure P-1 dated 05.02.2024 is hereby quashed. Respondents are at liberty to pass orders afresh in accordance with law, if they so desire.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)

JUDGE