



2026:CGHC:13304

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 8857 of 2022**

Smt. Shakuntala Gandharv W/o Shri Baldau Gandharv Aged About 47 Years
Occupation- Anganbadi Worker, Aanganbadi Center- Majhgaon No. 1, Tahsil
Kawardha, District- Kabirdham Chhattisgarh, R/o Village Majhgaon, Tahsil
Kawardha, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner**versus**

- 1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Woman And Child Development, New Mantralaya, New Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 2** - The Commissioner Durt, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh.
- 3** - The Collector Kabirdham, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh.
- 4** - Additional Collector Kabirdham, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh.
- 5** - The Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh.
- 6** - The Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Kawardha, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh.
- 7** - The District Program Officer Department Of Women And Child Development Kabirdham, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh.
- 8** - The Project Officer Ekikrit Bal Vikas Pariyojana Kawardha, District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Balraj Gupta on behalf of Mr. Bhupendra Singh, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amandeep Singh, Panel Lawyer

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey****Order on Board****19/03/2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition challenging the order passed by the Commissioner in Revision Revenue Case No. 186/B-121/ year2020-21 dated 11.10.2022, whereby the revision preferred by the petitioner was dismissed on account of delay, as there was a delay of two months in filing the revision case.
2. Mr. Gupta would submit that the petitioner, who was working on the post of Anganwadi Worker at Anganbadi Center, Majhgaon, Tahsil Kawardha, District Kabirdham was removed by the Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Kawardha, District Kabirdham, vide order dated 04.07.2018. He would further submit that the said order was challenged by way of an appeal before the Collector, which was dismissed by the Additional Collector vide order dated 14.01.2019, thereafter, a revision was preferred before the Commissioner along with an application for condonation of delay. He would also submit that sufficient cause was shown in the application for condonation of delay, but the Commissioner, vide order dated 11.10.2022, rejected the application for condonation of delay and consequently dismissed the revision petition. He would contend that the Commissioner ought to have taken a lenient view while deciding the application for condonation of delay. He would further contend that the petitioner has a good case on merits; thus, he prays to allow this petition.
3. On the other hand, counsel appearing for the State would oppose the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submit that the application for condonation of delay filed by the petitioner along with the revision petition did not disclose sufficient cause, and therefore, same was rightly rejected and the revision petition was dismissed; thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed.



4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents.
5. It appears that the revision petition was preferred by the petitioner along with an application for condonation of delay against the order passed by the Collector dated 14.01.2019. The petitioner has stated in the application that she applied for a certified copy of the order dated 14.01.2019 on 12.01.2021 and same was supplied on 22.01.2021, and thereafter the revision petition was preferred on 24.02.2021. It is also stated that final outcome of revision was not communicated promptly by her counsel.
6. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, in my opinion, sufficient cause was shown by the petitioner in the application for condonation of delay, therefore, the order passed by the Commissioner dated 11.10.2022 (Annexure P/1) is hereby **set aside**, and the matter is remitted back to the Commissioner to decide the revision petition preferred by the petitioner on merits. The petitioner shall appear before the concerned Commissioner on 30.04.2026.
7. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby **allowed** to the extent indicated hereinabove.
8. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE

Nadim