



2026:CGHC:12731

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 10118 of 2019

1 - Nakulram Nagesh S/o Shri Ratan Singh Aged About 32 Years R/o Village Pipalkhuta, Gram Panchayat, Dhanoura, Block Mainpur, District Gariyaband Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Commissioner Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Council (Mgnrega), Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Collector Gariyaband, District Gariyaband Chhattisgarh., District : Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh

4 - Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Gariyaband Chhattisgarh, District Gariyaband Chhattisgarh., District : Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh

5 - Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Mainpur, District Gariyaband Chhattisgarh., District : Gariyabandh, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mrs. Meena Shastri, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Surendra Dewangan, PL.
For Respondent No.5	:	Mr. Devesh Chandra Verma, Advocate.



(Single Bench)

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

17/03/2026

1. The petitioner is challenging the impugned order dated 20.12.2016 (Annexure P/1) passed by respondent No.5 whereby the petitioner has been terminated from service.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was appointed as Rojgar Sahayak purely on contract basis for a period of one year on 15.5.2007. However, the services of the petitioner have been terminated without affording any opportunity of hearing and without conducting any enquiry. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.
3. Per contra, learned State Counsel and learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.5 would support the impugned order.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their rival submissions made herein-above and went through the records with utmost circumspection.
5. Since the impugned order has been passed without affording any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, it is liable to be and is hereby set aside. However, it is observed that since the petitioner was a contractual employee and contract period of one year has already been expired, the petitioner will not be entitled for reinstatement. However, the impugned order (Annexure-P/1) will



not debar the petitioner from participating in the future recruitment process.

6. With the aforesaid direction/observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

Barve