



2026:CGHC:9927-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WA No. 188 of 2026

Santosh Chipanpalli Son Of Late Shri Madaniya Aged About 47 Years Working As Lecturer (LB), And Posted At Government High School Gadapal, Block And District - Dantewada, Chhattisgarh.

... Appellant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Education Mantralaya Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Joint Director Public Instruction Bastar Division Jagdalpur, District - Bastar, Chhattisgarh.

3 - District Education Officer Dantewada District South Bastar Dantewada, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Ashwani Kumar Kanwar Working As Lecturer (LB) And Incharge Of Principal At Government High School Gadapal, Block And District - Dantewada, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Appellant	: Mr.Bharat Lal Sahu, Advocate
For Respondents	: Mr.Shashank Thakur, Additional Advocate
No.1 to 3/State	General
For Respondent	: Mr.Vinod Kumar Dewangan, Advocate
No.4	



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

26.02.2026

1. Heard Mr.Bharat Lal Sahu, learned counsel for the appellant as well as Mr.Shashank Thakur, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for respondents No.1 to 3/State and Mr.Vinod Kumar Dewangan, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4.
2. The appellant has filed this writ appeal against the order dated 21.01.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No. 9537 of 2023 by which the learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner / appellant herein.
3. Brief facts necessary for disposal of the case are that the appellant is working as a Lecturer (L.B.) and is posted at Government High School, Gadapal, Block and District Dantewada, Chhattisgarh, where he has been discharging his duties sincerely and regularly. Thereafter, vide order dated 30.09.2022, the appellant was transferred from Government High School, Gadapal, Block and District Dantewada, to Government Higher Secondary School, Gadiras, Block Sukma, District Sukma, Chhattisgarh, which transfer order was challenged by the appellant by filing Writ Petition (S) No. 7005/2022, wherein this Court, vide order dated 04.11.2022, granted a status quo order in favour of the appellant, pursuant to which the appellant continues to perform his duties



efficiently at Government High School, Gadapal, Block and District Dantewada. The appellant, while working as Lecturer (L.B.), had earlier also been entrusted with the charge of Principal and worked as In-charge Principal at Government High School, Gadapal, and there was no complaint whatsoever regarding the discharge of his duties as In-charge Principal, as evident from letter dated 08.04.2015 issued by the Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Dantewada, under the office of the Collector, District South Bastar, Dantewada, Chhattisgarh. Despite the subsisting status quo order dated 04.11.2022, respondent No. 3, vide impugned letter dated 14.11.2022, failed to comply with the said order and illegally assigned the charge of Principal to private respondent No. 4, who is junior to the appellant, inasmuch as the appellant is placed at Serial No. 4612 whereas private respondent No. 4 is placed at Serial No. 9200 in the seniority list dated 02.06.2023, the said action being based on the erroneous transfer order dated 30.09.2022. Thereafter, the appellant submitted representations to the concerned respondent authorities seeking restoration of the charge of Principal in his favour in place of his junior, private respondent No. 4, but no action has been taken till date, and therefore the appellant has been constrained to approach this Court with a prayer to cancel the charge of Principal granted to private respondent No. 4 and to direct consideration and decision of the petitioner's pending representations in accordance with law and seniority, at the earliest. By the impugned



order, learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant herein. Hence, this writ appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge is contrary to the facts and material available on record and suffers from serious legal infirmities. The learned Single Judge failed to properly appreciate the pleadings and documents placed before the Court and has dismissed the writ petition without due consideration of the relevant aspects of the matter. He further submits that complaints were made by the Sarpanch and the local M.L.A. to the competent authorities against Private Respondent No. 4 alleging that he was not properly discharging his duties, that he failed to take proper care of the students, that the academic performance and 10th class results were unsatisfactory, and that he had committed irregularities in the discharge of his official duties. Copies of the complaint dated 15.10.2025 and related representations have been filed collectively as **Annexure A-2**. These material documents have not been adequately considered while upholding the impugned order. He also submits that the appellant was initially appointed as Lecturer vide order dated 30.04.2005, whereas Private Respondent No. 4 was appointed as Lecturer much later, vide order dated 15.02.2013. The appellant is admittedly senior to Private Respondent No. 4. In the seniority list, the appellant's name appears at Serial No. 4612, whereas the name of Private Respondent No. 4 appears at Serial No. 9200. Despite such clear



seniority, the junior officer has been favoured in an arbitrary manner. It is contended that the appellant was appointed as In-charge Principal by letter dated 08.04.2015 and had been continuously discharging his duties on the said post for more than seven years with satisfactory performance. However, by the impugned order dated 14.11.2022, Private Respondent No. 4 has been wrongly appointed as In-charge Principal in place of the appellant, without assigning any justifiable reason and in complete disregard of seniority and established service norms. He contended that the action of the authorities in appointing a junior officer as In-charge Principal, superseding the senior appellant, is arbitrary, illegal, and violative of settled principles governing service jurisprudence. The impugned action is not only contrary to law but also smacks of favoritism and non-application of mind. It is further submitted that the learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petition without properly appreciating the material on record and without adequately addressing the specific grounds raised by the appellant. The impugned judgment, therefore, warrants interference by this Court in exercise of its appellate jurisdiction. In view of the aforesaid submissions, it is prayed that this Court may be pleased to set aside the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge as well as the order dated 14.11.2022 appointing Private Respondent No. 4 as In-charge Principal, and grant appropriate relief in favour of the appellant.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel opposes the



submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellant and submits that the learned Single Judge after considering all the aspects of the matter has rightly dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant herein, in which no interference is called for.

6. We have learned counsel for the parties and perused the impugned order and other documents appended with writ appeal.
7. From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that learned Single Judge has observed that the petitioner, who is substantively holding the post of Lecturer (L.B.), does not possess any legal, statutory, or vested right to claim or insist upon being entrusted with the charge of the post of Principal merely on the basis of seniority or past officiation. It is well settled that assignment of charge to a higher post is a matter of administrative exigency and discretion of the employer and cannot be claimed as a matter of right. The transfer of the petitioner vide order dated 30.09.2022 was effected on administrative grounds, and pursuant thereto, the competent authority, in exercise of its lawful discretion, assigned the charge of Principal to respondent No. 4 vide order dated 14.11.2022. The interim status quo order dated 04.11.2022, as specifically pleaded by the State, was not within the knowledge of the authorities at the time of issuance of the impugned letter, and in any event, such interim protection does not confer upon the petitioner an enforceable right to hold additional charge. The petitioner's reliance on seniority and previous discharge of duties



as In-charge Principal does not create any indefeasible entitlement, particularly when the assignment of charge is temporary in nature and subject to administrative assessment. Moreover, the allegations raised against respondent No. 4 are unsupported by cogent material and appear to stem from personal grievance rather than any demonstrable illegality.

8. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, perusing the documents appended with writ petition as also with writ appeal and also considering the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge while dismissing the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner / appellant herein, we are of the considered opinion that the learned Single Judge has not committed any illegality, irregularity or jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting interference by this Court.
9. Accordingly, the writ appeal being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**. No cost(s).

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice