



2026:CGHC:20881

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3885 of 2026

Dr. B.D. Jangde S/o Shri Puran Das Jangde Aged About 60 Years Posted As Assistant Professor, Govt. Vedram College, Malkharoda, District- Sakti (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Higher Education Department, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

2 - The Under Secretary (Up-Sachiv) Department Of Higher Education, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

3 - The Commissioner Department Of Higher Education, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan / Directorate Of Higher Education, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, (C.G.)

4 - The Principal Govt. Vedram College, Malkharoda, District- Sakti, (C.G.)

5 - Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission (Psc) Through Its Secretary, North Block, Sector-19, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner : Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate

For State : Mr. Avinash Singh, G.A.

For Respondent No. 5 : Dr. Sudeep Agrawal, Advocate

HON'BLE SHRI PARTH PRATEEM SAHU, JUDGE

ORDER ON BOARD

05.05.2026

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

“10.1 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to

issue an appropriate writ, thereby directing the respondents to decide the pending representation of petitioner (Annexure P-3), within stipulated period.

10.2 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to immediately consider the petitioner for promotion to the post of Professor with all consequential benefits including arrears of pay, seniority and other retiral benefits.

10.3 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to pass such other order(s) or direction(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case in the interest of justice.”

2. Learned counsel for petitioners submit that petitioner was not promoted on the post of Professor from the post of Assistant Professor considering the ACR which was not communicated to petitioner enabling them to make representation. He contended that respondents-authorities could not have taken into consideration ACR of petitioner which was not communicated at the time of consideration of his name for promotion. In support of his contention, he places reliance upon the case of Dev Dutt vs. Union of India reported in (2008) 8 SCC 725. Petitioner had submitted representation raising his grievance before Respondent authorities which is pending consideration and therefore at this stage he is not pressing this writ petition on merit and only seeking direction to consider and take decision on the representation at the earliest within specific time frame. He further submits that petitioner may also be permitted to submit fresh representation to be considered by the concerned authorities along with pending representation.

3. Learned counsel for respective respondents submit that in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for petitioners, they are having no objection.
4. On due consideration of the submission of learned counsel for the respective parties, this writ petition at this stage is disposed of permitting the petitioner to submit fresh comprehensive representation along with all relevant documents before Respondents No. 1 & 5 and if such a representation is submitted, concerned authority shall consider and take decision regarding uncommunicated ACR from 2008 to 2012 of the petitioner, in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably within a further period of 02 months from the date of receipt of representation.
5. Accordingly, with the aforesaid observation and direction, this writ petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
JUDGE

Saurabh