



WPS No. 4475 of 2026



2026:CGHC:23587

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 4475 of 2026**

- Smt. Snigdha Gwal W/o Manish G. Yadav, Aged About 28 Years, Occupation Lecturer (Biology) Government Higher Secondary School Urga District- Korba (C.G.).

... Petitioner**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.).
2. Director Public Instruction Directorate, Chhattisgarh First Floor, C-Block Indiravati Bhavan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.).
3. Deputy Director, Directorate Of Public Instruction, Chhattisgarh First Floor C-Block Indiravati Bhavan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.).
4. Joint Director, Education Department Bilaspur, Division Bilaspur District- Bilaspur (C.G.).
5. Collector Korba District- Korba (C.G.).
6. Secretary District Rationalization Committee (District Education Officer) Korba, District- Korba (C.G.).
7. Secretary Block Rationalization Committee Block Education Officer Korba District- Korba (C.G.).
8. Principal, Government Higher Secondary School Urga District- Korba (C.G.).

... Respondents



For Petitioner :- Mr. Nikhil Wadhwani, Advocate.
For State :- Mr. Avinash Singh, Government Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order On Board

04.06.2026

1. By way of this writ petition, the petitioner has sought following reliefs:

10.1 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this petition and the respondents may kindly be directed looking to the vacant post of Zoology lecturer at Balco Korba as well as the Kasturba Gandhi, Katghora, and looking to the fact that the study of students of zoology subject the petitioner may be permitted to continue in any one school out of the aforementioned 2 schools, till the decision of the representation of the petitioner, in the interest of justice.

10.2 That, 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 along with cost of the petition.

2. Mr. Nikhil Wadhwani, learned counsel for the petitioner, would submit that earlier petitioner has filed the writ petition before this Court in which the petitioner was directed to file the representation for rationalization and the same was



directed to be decided by the respondent-authorities. He would also submit that though two orders have been passed, but the said two orders have been passed in respect of the schools where no vacant post is available under the Rationalization Policy. He would further submit that the petitioner has again filed a representation while stating that the earlier two orders which has been passed for the petitioner in respect of the schools where no vacant post is available and, as such, the petitioner could not be accommodated under the Rationalization Policy. Moreover, the petitioner has filed the representation before the authorities concerned stating that where one post is still available in Government Boys Higher Secondary School Balco, Korba and Kasturba Gandhi Residential School, Katghora in which the petitioner can be accommodated under the Rationalization Policy, therefore, respondent-authorities may be directed to consider and decide the petitioner's representation considering the two options given by the petitioner herein.

3. Mr. Avinash Singh, learned State counsel, is having no objection, if the direction is issued to the respondent authorities to consider the petitioner's representation and decide the same in accordance with law keeping in view the



fact that the petitioner has given option of two schools where the post is available.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their submissions made here in above.
5. Admittedly, the respondent-authorities are required to post the petitioner in accordance with law where post is available under the scheme of Rationalization Policy. Since the petitioner is required to be posted in the school where the post is vacant under the Rationalization Policy and for the same the petitioner has given two options, the respondent authorities are directed to consider and decide the petitioner's representation within further 45 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order considering the options given by the petitioner herein. However, it is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion of the case.
6. With the aforesaid observation/direction the instant writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
JUDGE

Ankit