



2026:CGHC:3180-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WA No. 33 of 2026**

Dr. Dineshwar Prasad Soni (D. K. Soni) S/o Late Ramji Prasad Soni
Aged About 47 Years R/o - Nawapara, Ambikapur, District Surguja
(C.G.)

... Appellant**versus**

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, General Administration
Department (RTI Cell), Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar,
Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Deputy Secretary General Administration Department, Mantralaya,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Search Committee Through Its Chairman Additional Chief Secretary,
Department of Home, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar,
Raipur (C.G.)

4 - Commissioner Public Relations Office, Indravati Bhawan, Nawa
Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant	:	Mr. Prasoon Agrawal, Advocate
For State/Respondents	:	Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General
For Intervenor	:	Mr. Ali Asgar, Advocate



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

20.01.2026

- 1 Heard Mr. Prasoon Agrawal, learned counsel for the appellant. Also heard Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General appearing for the State/respondents as well as Mr. Ali Asgar, learned counsel appearing for the Intervenor.
- 2 The present intra Court appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 11.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.3811 of 2025, whereby the learned Single Judge has dismissed of the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner along with other writ petitions.
- 3 It has been pointed out by learned counsel for the parties that in an identical matter, this Court had dismissed ***Writ Appeal No.975 of 2025*** vide order dated ***09.01.2026*** observing as follows :

"7. Perusal of paragraphs 26 to 28 of the impugned order clearly establishes that the learned Single Judge has appreciated the pleadings, facts and settled position of law, and has affirmed the validity of the short-listing process adopted by the Search Committee. The learned Single Judge has recorded a categorical finding that the writ petitioners had neither pleaded nor substantiated any allegation of mala fides, arbitrariness or lack of rationality in the procedure adopted for short-listing, and that



the only grievance raised pertained to non-publication of the short-listing criteria prior to its application. The learned Single Judge has interpreted the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Anjali Bhardwaj v. Union of India by holding that there is no absolute mandate requiring prior publication of the short-listing methodology, and that the essential requirement is that such methodology must be applied in a rational, objective and non-discriminatory manner, which has been meticulously followed by the respondents. The finding that the petitioners failed to demonstrate any prejudice caused to them on account of non-publication of the short-listing criteria is in consonance with settled law that interference in selection processes is warranted only when demonstrable prejudice or illegality is established. In the absence of any proven arbitrariness, mala fides or violation of statutory or constitutional provisions, the learned Single Judge has concluded that no illegality was committed by the respondents so as to vitiate the selection process, and has thus dismissed the writ petitions and vacated the interim order, warranting no interference.

8. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge, we notice that the same has been rendered with cogent and justifiable reasons. In an intra-court appeal, no interference is usually warranted unless palpable infirmities are noticed on a plain reading of the impugned order. In the facts and circumstances of the instant case, on a plain reading of order, we do not notice any such palpable infirmity or perversity, as such, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order.



9. Accordingly, the writ appeal being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby dismissed. No cost(s)."

They further submitted that since the facts and issue involved in the present case is identical to that of Writ Appeal No.975 of 2025, this appeal may also be disposed off in the same terms.

- 4** Having considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and having gone through the materials on record, it is evident that the facts and issue involved in this appeal is identical to **Writ Appeal No.975 of 2025**, this Court deems it appropriate not to take a view other than what has been taken in **Writ Appeal No.975 of 2025**.
- 5** Accordingly, the present appeal is **dismissed** in terms of the order dated **09.01.2026** passed in **Writ Appeal No.975 of 2025**.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice