



Digitally
signed by
YOGESH
TIWARI
Date:
2026.02.24
19:31:08
+0530



2026:CGHC:9360
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 9474 of 2023

Smt. Sangeeta Dewangan W/o Uma Shankar Dewangan Aged About 48 Years R/o Nagar Panchayat Simga, District- Balaudabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

- 1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Administration And Development, Mantralaya At Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur District Raipur (C.G.)
- 2 - Collector District Baloudabazar (C.G.)
- 3 - Yashwant Verma The Chief Municipal Officer Nagar Panchayat Simga, District- Balauda Bazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)
- 4 - Nagar Panchayat Simga Through The Chief Municipal Officer Simga, District- Balauda Bazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)
- 5 - President Aantarik Parivad Vaad Samiti, Gram Panchayat Simga, District Balodabazar (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Awadh Tripathi, Advocate
For State/Respondents No.1 and 2	: Mr. Arpit Agrawal, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.3 and 4	: Ms. Katyayani Vishupriya, Advocate (through V.C.).

Hon’ble Shri Amitendra Kishore Prasad, Judge
Order on Board

23.02.2026

1. The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition with the following relief(s):-

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this petition and direct the

respondent no.03 to continue the services of the petitioner.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly directe the respondent to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization looking to more than 23 years of uninterrupted service at the respondent Nagar Panchayat.

10.3 Any other relief, which may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, may also be allowed.”

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner has been serving under respondent No.4, Nagar Panchayat, Simga, for more than 23 years and has been discharging all duties assigned to her diligently and without complaint. It is the case of the petitioner that respondent No.3 directed her to perform domestic work at his private residence, which she refused as the same was beyond the scope of her official duties. Thereafter, at the instance of respondent No.3, she was subjected to continuous harassment by the Cleaning Incharge and the Revenue Officer, who deliberately compelled her to perform humiliating cleaning tasks while similarly situated employees were not subjected to such treatment. Upon raising objection and submitting written complaints dated 25.10.2023 and 27.10.2023 to the competent authorities and despite subsequent correspondence made by higher authorities, respondent No.3, in retaliation, restrained the petitioner from

continuing in service with effect from 27.10.2023, without issuing any order, notice, or following due process of law.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, after arguing the matter at considerable length and drawing the attention of this Court to the factual matrix as well as the long and continuous service rendered by the petitioner since the year 1999, fairly submits that at this stage he may be permitted to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to submit a comprehensive and duly detailed representation before the competent authorities ventilating all her grievances. It is further prayed that in the event such representation is submitted within a time to be stipulated by this Court, the respondent authorities be directed to consider and decide the same objectively, in accordance with law, by taking into account the undisputed fact that the petitioner has rendered long years of service since 1999 and has worked continuously for decades. Learned counsel emphasizes that the petitioner does not wish to press the petition on merits at this juncture and would be satisfied if a direction is issued to the competent authority to consider her claim sympathetically and in the light of her past service record, continuity of engagement, and the principles governing fair treatment of long-serving employees. He therefore seeks withdrawal of the petition with the aforesaid liberty and appropriate direction.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respective respondents jointly submit that they have no objection if the petitioner is permitted to submit a fresh and comprehensive representation before the competent authority, and further submit that in the event such representation is filed within the time granted by this Court, the same shall be considered and decided strictly in accordance with law.
5. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the material available with the writ petition.
6. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds it appropriate, in the interest of justice, to permit the petitioner to submit a fresh and comprehensive representation before the competent authority. The petitioner claims to have rendered long and continuous service since the year 1999. It is also stated that she initially worked directly under the Nagar Panchayat, Simga, and thereafter her services were continued through an outsourcing agency, namely Jai Enterprises, though the nature of duties performed and the place of posting remained unchanged. The said aspects are required to be duly considered by the competent authority in accordance with law.
7. In view of the aforesaid submissions and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the petitioner is permitted to submit a detailed representation before the competent authority

within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

8. In the event such representation is filed within the aforesaid period, the respondent authorities, including the Nagar Panchayat, Simga, shall consider and decide the same in accordance with law by taking into account the entire length of service claimed by the petitioner since 1999, the nature of her engagement, and the fact that she is stated to have initially worked under the Nagar Panchayat and thereafter through Jai Enterprises. The competent authority shall pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of 45 days from the date of filing of the representation.
9. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the writ petition stands **disposed of**. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Yogesh