



2026:CGHC:21633

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3982 of 2022

1 - Ramesh Singh Parihar S/o Late H.S. Parihar Aged About 60 Years Presently Posted As Professor (Electrical Engineering) At Government Engineering College Raipur, District Raipur, R/o Care Of M.P. Sharma, Mig-123, Sector-3, D D Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Skill Development, Technical Education And Employment, Ministry, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Atal Nagar, Police Station And Post Office Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Director, Directorate Of Technical Education, Vibhagadhyaksh Bhawan, Indrawati Bhawan, 3rd-4th Floor, Block-3, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Under Secretary Department Of Skill Development, Technical Education And Employment, Ministry, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Atal Nagar, Police Station And Post Office Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

4 - Principal Government Engineering College Raipur, Old Dhamtari Road, Sejbahar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Apoorva pandey, Advocate holding the brief of Shri Sandeep Singh, Advocate.
For Respondents/ State	:	Shri Amandeep Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Judgment On Board

08.05.2026

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

“10.1 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash/ set-aside the impugned order Dated 28.12.2021 (Annexure-P/1) issued by the Under Secretary, Department of Skill Development & Technical Education & Employment, Chhattisgarh;

10.2 The Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent State to grant any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in favour of the petitioner as per the facts & circumstance of the present case, in the ends of justice.”

2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was appointed as an Associate Professor under respondent No.4 and subsequently, promoted to the post of Professor in the year 2015. She would submit that the petitioner moved an application forgoing further promotion to the post of Principal/ Additional Director; however, he was promoted to the post of Principal vide order dated 28.12.2021. She would contend that an interim order was passed in favour of the petitioner on 21.6.2022 and the petitioner is still working on the post of Professor. She would contend that the petitioner may be permitted to make a representation before respondents No.1 & 2 and in turn, the said authorities may be directed to consider the

representation so made by the petitioner strictly in accordance with law.

- 3) On the other hand, learned counsel for the State would oppose the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He would submit that the petitioner was promoted strictly in accordance with law vide order dated 28.12.2021 and he has no right to forgo promotion to the post of Principal. He would contend that the petition is misconceived and deserves to be dismissed.
- 4) I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record.
- 5) Taking into consideration the fact that an application was moved by the petitioner forgoing his promotion, to higher post prior to issuance of the promotion order dated 28.12.2021, whereby the petitioner was promoted to the post of Principal, and further considering that an interim order passed in favour of the petitioner on 21.6.2022 is still operating and he is still working on the post of Professor and has not yet accepted promotion to the post of Principal, this petition is disposed of reserving liberty in favour of the petitioner to make a detailed representation before respondents No.1 & 2 within a period of 30 days and in turn, respondents No.1 & 2 are directed to consider the representation so made by the petitioner in an objective manner, preferably within a further period of 90 days. For a period of 120 days, the interim order granted on 21.6.2022 shall remain in force.

6) With the aforesaid observation(s), and direction(s), this petition is
disposed of.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Nimmi