



2026:CGHC:27154

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7294 of 2022

**1 - Ankur Soni S/o Shri Suresh Soni Aged About 25 Years R/o Village Dumardih
Post Dumardih, Tehsil Lundra, District : Surguja (Ambikapur), Chhattisgarh
... Petitioner(s)**

versus

- 1 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Animal Husbandry,
Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh**
- 2 - The Collector (Animal Development Department) Balrampur, District : Balrampur,
Chhattisgarh**
- 3 - The Deputy Director Animal Animal Health Service Balrampur, District :
Balrampur, Chhattisgarh**
- 4 - Kusumlata Shyam Aged About 48 Years Present Working As Assistant Vetnary
Medical Officer Shankargarh Balrampur, District : Balrampur, Chhattisgarh
... Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner/s	:	Shri Shivam Mishra, Advocate holding the brief of Shri Kishan Lal Sahu, Advocate.
For Respondent/ State	:	Shri Amandeep Singh, P.L.

Hon’ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey
Judgment On Board

02.07.2026

1) The petitioner has filed this petition seeking the following reliefs:

“10.1 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the records pertaining to removal of the petitioner related to order dated 01/07/2022 and 04/07/2022 from the respondents for kind perusal of the Hon' ble Court.

10.2 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to set aside the removal of the petitioner related to order dated 01/07/2022 and 04/07/2022 and accordingly issue order in the favor of the petitioner.

10.3 That the Honble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authority to pay the salary of the petitioner of last 5 month accordingly.

10.4 Any other relief which the Hon'ble Court may deem fit, in the interest of justice.”

2) Learned counsel for the petitioner would argue that the petitioner was appointed to the post of Assistant Veterinary Medical Officer at Shankargarh, District Balrampur on 15.4.2021 on a contractual basis for a period of one year. He would submit that the services of the petitioner were not extended by respondent No.3, as the ACR of the petitioner was graded as “Average” vide orders dated 1.7.2022 and 4.7.2022. He would submit that no opportunity of hearing was afforded to the petitioner and therefore, the decision taken by respondent No.3 is bad in law. He would pray to allow this petition.

- 3) On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State would submit that the decision has been taken by respondent No.3 pursuant to the Chhattisgarh Civil Services (Contract Appointment) Rules, 2012. He would submit that the orders dated 1.7.2022 & 4.7.2022 (Annexure-P/2) are neither stigmatic nor punitive in nature. He would submit that there was no need to provide an opportunity of hearing or to conduct an enquiry, as the services of the petitioner were discontinued strictly in accordance with Rule 11 (4) & (5) of the Rules, 2012. He would submit 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) Admittedly, the petitioner was appointed on contractual basis vide order dated 15.4.2021. The services of the petitioner were not extended on expiry of the contractual period and the said decision has been challenged by the petitioner by filing the present petition. A perusal of Annexure-P/2 dated 1.7.2022 & 4.7.2022 would show that the said orders are neither stigmatic nor punitive against the petitioner.
- 6) A perusal of the documents would reveal that a show-cause notice was issued to the petitioner on 22.1.2022 and thereafter, a decision was taken after due consideration of the reply submitted by the petitioner.

7) Rule 11 (4) & (5) of Rules, 2012, reads as under:

“11(4) Contract appointment shall stand terminated automatically on expiry of the period of the contract appointment and there shall be no need to issue separate order terminating the service.

(5) Either of both the parties may terminate the contract appointment during the period of contract appointment by giving one month's notice in advance or paying one month's salary in its place.”

8) Having considered the facts of the present case, the provisions of Rule 11 (4) & (5) of Rules, 2012 and further the language employed in Order Annexure-P/2 dated 1.7.2022 & 4.7.2022, which is neither punitive nor stigmatic, I am of the opinion that no case is made out for interference.

9) Accordingly, this petition fails and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Nimmi