

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Order Sheet

WPS No 5520 of 2022.

Dr. Sandhya Verma vs. State of Chhattisgarh

31-03-2023	Mr. Alok Bakshi and Ms. Prakriti Deo, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Sandeep Dubey, Dy. Advocate General for the State. Mr. Anand Mohan Tiwari, counsel for respondent No.6. The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition contending that she was appointed as an Assistant Professor in the Medical College, Mahasamund, but for the reasons best to her, she could not joint the duties, therefore, she has moved an application for extension of time which was not replied. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in the same Medical Education Department, Ms. Supriya Gupta, Assistant Professor who has been appointed through Public Service Commission has been granted benefit of extension of time and her joining period has been extended on 17-6-2022 whereas during pendency of the writ petition, the candidature of the petitioner has been rejected on the count that there is no such provision. The State has filed its reply but they have not dealt with the case of discrimination meted out by the petitioner and even 15 days time has been granted to the petitioner under which provisions of rules they have not placed on record. Let State file an affidavit and explain why the discrimination has been carried out against the petitioner and even if there is no impediment in issuing the petitioner's appointment order on the post of Assistant Professor, the State shall examine and file an affidavit as during validity of the selection list, the petitioner has moved an application for extension of time which has not been considered without assigning any reason.

	List this case on 2-5-2023. Sd/- (Narendra Kumar Vyas) Judge
--	---

Raju