



2026:CGHC:13494

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 2617 of 2026**

Deepak Kumar Gada S/o Pardesh Gada Aged About 45 Years Resident Of
Village- Kheri Post, Bortara Tehsil Saja District- Bemetara Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Its Secretary Department Of Panchayat
And Rural Development Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur District-
Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - The Collector District- Bemetara Chhattisgarh.

3 - Deputy Director Zila Panchayat Bemetara District- Bemetara
Chhattisgarh,

4 - Chief Executive Officer Office Of Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat
Bemetara District- Bemetara Chhattisgarh,

5 - Chief Executive Officer Office Of Chief Executive Officer, Janpad
Panchayat Bemetara District- Bemetara Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For petitioner	: Mr. Purnendra Khichariya, Advocate
For Respondents	: Ms. Shailja Shukla, G.A.

HON'BLE SHRI PARTH PRATEEM SAHU, JUDGE**ORDER ON BOARD****20/03/2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking following reliefs.

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly
be pleased to allow the petition and may



kindly set aside the order dated 17.01.2026 (Annexure P-1) and District reinstate the petitioner on the post of Panchayat Secretary Village Kheri, Tehsil Saja, Bemetara and also granted the consequential benefit as the petitioner is entitled from the date of appointment i.e. 06.04.1996 (Annexure P-3).

10.2 Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper also kindly be granted to petitioner, in the interest of justice."

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the petitioner while working on the post of Panchayat Secretary was terminated from service on 06.04.1996. Petitioner thereafter submitted an appeal before Jila Panchayat which was dismissed on 17.01.2026. Termination of the petitioner is without following due process of law, therefore, it is to be quashed.
3. Counsel for the state submits that the order of termination of the petitioner has been challenged after long lapse of time about more than 20 years and accordingly, respondent No. 4 has dismissed the representation / appeal submitted by the petitioner on the ground of delay and therefore, there is no merit in the writ petition.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.
5. Submission of counsel for the State that the petitioner has challenged the order of his termination dated 06.04.1997 after more than 20 years is not disputed by counsel for the petitioner. Respondent No. 4 also dismissed the representation / appeal submitted by the petitioner against his order of termination on the ground of delay and laches observing that appeal / representation was submitted beyond period of 90 days. In the facts of the case where the petitioner slept over his rights for about 20 years, to challenge his termination order, in the



opinion of this Court, the claim of petitioner is a stale claim.

Respondent No. 4 has not committed any error in dismissing the appeal / representation submitted by the petitioner vide Order Annexure-P/1 on the ground of delay and laches.

6. For the foregoing discussion, I do not find any merit in this writ petition, accordingly, it is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE

Saurabh