



2026:CGHC:14967

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### WPS No. 2254 of 2021

- Vasudeo Kumar Pradhan S/o Sanatan Pradhan, Aged About 44 Years Presently Posted And Working As Lecturer (Lb), Govt. Higher Secondary School, Milupara, Block Tamnar, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh  
... **Petitioner(s)**

**versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Post Office And Police Station Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Post Office And Police Station Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Director, Directorate Of Public Instructions, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Post Office And Police Station Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. District Education Officer, Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

... **Respondent(s)**

|                      |   |                               |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | : | Mr. Dhani Ram Patel, Advocate |
| For State            | : | Mr. Abhishek Singh, P.L.      |
| For Respondent No. 4 | : | Mr. Vedant Shadangi, Advocate |



**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**

**Order On Board**

**1.4.2026**

1) By way of this petition, petitioner have sought following reliefs :-

i. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the order dated 27.11.2020 bearing No.Estb.2/Lect./Judl.Pro./25/2020/456 passed by the respondent No.3.

ii. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to place the petitioner in Lectürer (LB) 'T' Cadre in place of 'E' Cadre, and permit him to render his services without any interruption.

iii. Cost of the petition may also be granted to the petitioner.

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

2) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that services of petitioner who was working on the post of Shiksha Karmi Grade-II were absorbed in July, 2018 and thereafter he was appointed against the post of Lecturer (LB) in "T" cadre vide order dated 29.9.2018. He further submits that petitioner should have been appointed against the post of Lecturer (LB) in "E" cadre, therefore a representation was made seeking change of cadre from "T" cadre to "E" cadre but no heed was paid. He contends that petitioner preferred WPS No. 10059 of 2019 before the High Court of Chhattisgarh which was disposed vide order dated 3.12.2019



directing the Director, Directorate Of Public Instructions to decide the representation. He further contends that representation made by petitioner was rejected vide order dated 27.11.2020. He argues that the initial paragraph of impugned order correctly identifies the petitioner, however the subsequent paragraphs and final determination erroneously center on the claims of a third party, Pradeep Kumar Sahu. He further argues that order impugned has been passed in a mechanical manner and deserves to be quashed.

- 3) On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respective respondents would oppose. They submit that services of petitioner were absorbed in "T" cadre therefore he was promoted to the post of Lecturer (LB) in "T" cadre and such decision was taken according to the policy. They further submit that representation made by the petitioner has been considered by the authority concerned and thereafter order impugned has been passed.
- 4) I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
- 5) Co-ordinate Bench vide order dated 3.12.2019 in WPS No. 10059 of 2019 directed the respondent authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner. In pursuance to the said order, Director, Directorate of Public Instruction in para-5 of its order dated 27.11.2020 has considered the claim of one Pradeep Kumar Sahu.



- 6) Taking into consideration the fact that representation of the petitioner has not been duly considered by the authority concerned and a mechanical order has been passed on 27.11.2020, therefore said order is hereby quashed. Accordingly, this petition stands **disposed**.
- 7) Petitioner would be at liberty to move a fresh representation before Director, Directorate of Public Instruction at the earliest, who in turn is directed to re-consider the representation, if so moved by the petitioner in light of judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***Union Public Service Commission Versus Bibhu Prasad Sarangi and Others*** reported in **(2021) 4 SCC 516**.

**Sd/-**  
**(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)**  
JUDGE

Ajinkya