



CGHC010122572022



2026:CGHC:34440

NAFR**HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 2583 of 2022**

Jyoti D/o Shri Ved Prakash Aged About 28 Years R/o Behind Samudayik Bhawan, Gunderdehi, Tahsil Gunderdehi, District- Balod Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner**versus**

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through- Secretary, Department of School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya New Raipur, District- Raipur Chhattisgarh.

2 - Joint Director Education Division, Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner : Mr. C. K. Sahu, Advocate

For Respondent(s)/State : Mr. Vivek Siddharth Ojha, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey**Order on Board****06/08/2026**

1. By way of this petition, petitioners have sought following reliefs:-

"10.i That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the impugned order dated 09.02.2022 (Annexure P/1), in the interest of justice.

(ii) That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to declare CTET certificate valid and to issue appointment order of the petitioner for the post of Teacher (English) with all the consequential benefit within stipulated time, 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 would submit that petitioner applied for the post of Teacher (English) pursuant to the advertisement issued for recruitment to the post of Teacher (English). After participating in the selection process, the result was declared in October, 2019 and the petitioner was provisionally selected and called for document verification. During verification, the petitioner was declared ineligible vide order dated 09.02.2022 on the ground that her CTET certificate dated 27.12.2019 had been obtained after declaration of the recruitment result. It is pleaded that the advertisement only prescribed possession of a valid CTET qualification and she possessed the requisite certificate on the date of document verification. He would further submit that under Clause 6(3) of the advertisement, the select list remained valid for one year, which was subsequently extended by one year and thereafter by six months; therefore, the petitioner's CTET qualification, obtained during the validity period of the select list, ought to have been accepted. He would also submit that the similarly situated candidates possessing CGTET qualification, whose result was declared after the cut-off date, were considered eligible, whereas the petitioner's candidature was rejected despite her possessing a valid CTET certificate. thus, he would pray that the impugned order may be quashed and the

respondents may be directed to consider case of the petitioner for appointment with all consequential benefits.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel would submit that the prescribed cut-off date for submission of the requisite educational and eligibility documents was 25.04.2019, whereas the petitioner passed the CTET examination and obtained the certificate only on 27.12.2019. Since the petitioner did not possess the prescribed qualification on the cut-off date, she was rightly declared ineligible; thus, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.
4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents.
5. The candidature of the petitioner was rejected solely on the ground that she obtained the CTET certificate on 27.12.2019, i.e., after the prescribed cut-off date. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner possessed the CTET qualification on the date of document verification.
6. The case of the petitioner is that the select list remained valid for one year and was subsequently extended by one year and thereafter by six months.
7. With regard to plea taken by the counsel for the petitioner that during the said extended period, similarly situated candidates possessing CGTET qualification, whose result was declared after the cut-off date, were considered eligible, whereas the petitioner's candidature was rejected despite her possessing a valid CTET certificate. In this regard,

no specific denial has been made by the respondents; thus, rejection of the candidature of the petitioner on the aforesaid ground cannot be sustained.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition deserves to be and is hereby **allowed**.

The impugned order dated **09.02.2022 (Annexure P/1)** is **quashed**.

9. The respondents are directed to consider the candidature of the petitioner for appointment to the post of Teacher (English) by treating her CTET qualification as valid, subject to fulfilment of all other eligibility conditions within a period of **90 days** from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE

Nadim