



2026:CGHC:9758

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 4241 of 2019**

1 - Gulame Mustafa Ansari, S/o. Md. Azim Ansari, Aged About 28 Years, R/o. Village Patekohra, Post Chichola, Tahsil Chhuria, Rajnandgaon, District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

2 - Rumi Ghosh, D/o. Shri Sanjay Ghosh, Aged About 28 Years, R/o. Near Gopal General Store, Rajatalab, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Vijay Tonder, S/o. Shri Rambhajan Tonder, Aged About 26 Years, R/o. H.No.109, Gautam Para, Village Sukhatal, Post Sarangpur, (Kala), District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioners**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Its Secretary, Public Work Department, Manatralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 – Director, Directorate Of Treasury Account And Pension, Indrawati Bhawan, Nayar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

3 - Chief Engineer, Public Work Department, North Block, Sector 19, Naya Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh



4 - Joint Director, Directorate Of Local Fund, Audit, Block -1, Naya Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

5 - Sadique Ui Malik, R/o. Hemu Nagar, In Front Of Gudaku Factory, Near Over Bridge Bilaspur, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

6 - Anshuman Dixit, R/o. Gond Para, Subhash Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

7 - Kaushal Kumar Sinha, Through Selection Committee, Public Work Department, North Block, Sector- 19, Naya Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

8 - Tansen Patel, Through Selection Committee, Public Work Department, North Block, Sector 19, Naya Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

9 - Neelmani Verma, Through Selection Committee, Public Work Department, North Block, Sector-19, Naya Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Ms. Apoorva Pandey, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For Respondents No.1 to 4	:	Mr. Sharad Mishra, Panel Lawyer
For Respondents No.5, 7, 8 & 9.	:	Ms. Anamika Singh, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Vinod Kumar Pandey, Advocate

(Single Bench)

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board



24.02.2026

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition claiming the following reliefs :

(i). The Hon'ble Court may kindly quash the impugned order dated 15.05.2019 for recounseling which is going to held on 31.05.2019 issued by the Chief Engineer, Public Work Department, Raipur (Annexure P-1).

(ii) The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent State to consider the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Computer Assistant Programmer at Directorate of Treasury Account & Pension, Raipur.

(iii) The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other writ/writs, order/orders, relief/reliefs in favour of the petitioner, which the Hon'ble Court deemed fit & Just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including awarding of the costs to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that State respondents be directed to consider the case of the petitioners for the post of Computer Assistant Programmer, Directorate of Treasury Account & Pension, Raipur.
3. Learned State counsel submits that the private respondents No.5 to 9 secured more marks than the petitioners and in earlier writ petitions, this Court has already directed the concerned respondents to call upon the petitioners for a fresh counseling, which has duly



been conducted and after taking part in the counseling, the merit list has been prepared, which has not been challenged. He further submits that the petitioners No.1 & 2 were kept in the waiting list as per their marks secured, which was lower than the marks obtained by the respondents No.5 to 9 and, as such, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the documents meticulously.
5. Recounseling has already been directed in first round of litigation in WPS No.1737 of 2019 (*Sadique Ui Malik v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*) and WPS No. 2824 of 2019 (*Anshuman Dixit v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*) and the same relief cannot be granted once it has been granted. In the result of recounseling, the petitioners have secured less marks than the private respondents No.5 to 9, therefore, I do not find any merit in this petition, the same deserves to be and accordingly dismissed.

Ashok

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge