



2026:CGHC:33187



CGHC010272972020



2026:CGHC:33187

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 5375 of 2020**

Smt. Kusumlata Soni W/o Late Brijmohan Soni Aged About 48 Years
R/o Sambalpur, Nawagarh, Block- Nawagarh, District Bemetara,
Chhattisgarh, District : Bemetara, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural
Development Department, Mahanadi Bahawan, Mantralaya, New
Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - The Commissioner, Durg Division, Durg, Chhattisgarh, District :
Durg, Chhattisgarh

3 - The Colector Bemetara, District Bemetara Chhattisgarh, District :
Bemetara, Chhattisgarh

4 - The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Janpad Panchayat
Nawagarh, District- Bemetara, Chhattisgarh, District : Bemetara,
Chhattisgarh

... Respondent*[Cause-title taken from Case Information System (CIS)]*

For Petitioner : Mr. Kishan Kumar Sonkar, Advocate on behalf
of Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For Respondents : Dr. SK Dewangan, Panel Lawyer

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**(Order on Board)****31.07.2026****1.** Heard.

2. This petition is directed against order dated 11.06.2020
(Annexure-P/01), passed by the Commissioner, Durg (respondent
No.02), whereby the revision of the petitioner against order of the
Collector dated 22.02.2018 has been dismissed on the ground that the



respondent No.02 has no jurisdiction of revision of the order passed by the Collector.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would make sole submission that while passing the order dated 22.02.2018, no opportunity of hearing was afforded to the petitioner, therefore, the same is liable to be set aside.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel supported the impugned orders and prays for dismissal of this petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their rival submissions made herein-above and went through the record with utmost circumspection.

6. In the case at hand, admittedly, since no opportunity of hearing was afforded to the petitioner while passing order dated 22.08.2018, therefore, the impugned orders dt. 11.06.2020, passed by the respondent No.02 (Commissioner) and dt. 22.02.2018, passed by the respondent No.03 (Collector) are hereby set aside. However, since the appointment of the petitioner was purely on contractual basis, therefore, he will not be entitled for any reinstatement or backwages.

7. With aforesaid observation, this writ petition stands finally **disposed of**.

sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge