



2026:CGHC:8293

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 9595 of 2023

Narendra Kumar Rathor, S/o Shri Arjun Lal Rathor, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Ward No. 21, Kera Road, Bhathapara, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department of Health And Family Welfare, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

2 – Director, Department of Helath, Mantralaya Indrawati Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Collector District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

4 - Divisional Joint Director Department Of Helath Services, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

5 - Chief Medical And Health Officer District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

6 - Lakhanlal Dewangan S/o Shri Ramji Dewangan Aged About 30 Years Ex-Peon, R/o - Village And Post - Khokhra, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

--- **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Mr. Shrijan Pandey, Advocate.

For Respondents/State : Mr. Arpit Agrawal, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order On Board

16.02.2026

1. By way of this petition, the Petitioner has prayed for following relief(s):-

“10.1. That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire records in relation to the case of the petitioner from the possession of respondents for its kind perusal.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ or writs/order or orders quashing impugned order dated 25.09.2023 (Annexure-P/1) being arbitrary, illegal and against the law.

10.3 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to take proper course of action against the respondent no. 6.

10.4 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to hold that the petitioners' appointment has been made in accordance with law.

10.5 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief/relief's in favour of the petitioner, which the Hon'ble Court deemed fit & just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including awarding of the costs to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No. 6/ Lakhanlal Dewangan has lodged a complaint assailing the petitioner's appointment. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner has preferred the present petition contending that respondent No. 6/ Lakhanlal Dewangan, has no locus standi or legal authority to challenge the

petitioner's appointment. It is therefore prayed that the petition be allowed.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents/State submits that the complaint filed by respondent No. 6-Lakhanlal Dewangan was thoroughly investigated by respondent No. 4 and upon inquiry, the allegations were found to be unsubstantiated. Consequently, the matter has been closed.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, gone through the pleadings and documents annexed with the writ petition.
5. From the perusal of reply filed by the State, it appears that a committee was constituted to verify the allegations made in the complaint filed by the complainant/respondent No. 6- Lakhan Lal Dewangan, the aforesaid enquiry committee after completion of the enquiry submitted the enquiry report before the Collector, Janjgir-Champa on 07.02.2024, the enquiry committee made certain observations in the enquiry report dated 05.02.2024, the respondent No. 6/complainant has not given any substantive documents with regard to the allegation made against the petitioner. Further, the respondent No.6 himself appointed as a Daily Wager not on the Collectorate rate. The respondent No. 6 made complaint against those employee/petitioner of the department who was appointed on Collectorate rate and their regularization was made as per the law. As also not a single employee has been promoted and regularized in completion after 05 years of service. Above the enquiry committee has held that entire allegation was made by the respondent No. 6 is false and fabricated.
6. Considering the aforesaid aspect of the matter, the writ petition is

disposed of while observing that since the complaint itself was not found to be proved against the petitioner as lodged by the respondent No. 6/Lakhanlal Dewangan, as such, nothing survives to adjudicate in this petition.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
JUDGE

AMIT PATEL