

Deepak Prasad Vs State Of Chhattisgarh And Ors

Court: Chhattisgarh High Court

Date of Decision: Feb. 12, 2018

Hon'ble Judges: Sanjay K. Agrawal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Shakti Raj Sinha, Dilman Rathi Minj

Judgement

Sanjay K. Agrawal, J

1. Grievance of the petitioner is that he was appointed as Shikshakarmi vide Annexure P/1 (filed collectively) along with number of other persons

including those whose names find place in the document Annexure P/4.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after about 1½ years of service, the petitioner's service was terminated by an oral order along with

other persons. Some of the persons filed writ petition before this Court and thereafter, their representations were considered and they have been given

appointment vide order dated 13.07.2017 (Annexure P-4). He submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if, at this stage, the petitioner

is permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to file representation before respondent No. 3 for similar relief. However, he prays for direction to

respondent No. 3 to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of order dated 13.07.2017 passed in favour of other similarly situated persons. He

further submits that some time limit may also be fixed for respondent No. 3 to pass order.

3. State counsel has no objection if any such direction is issued to respondent No. 3. He, however, submits that the petitioner's case would be

considered strictly in accordance with law subject to their suitability.

4. In view of above, the petitioner is permitted to withdraw this petition with the aforesaid liberty. In the eventuality of filing fresh representation along

with copy of this order by the petitioner before respondent No. 3 within three weeks from today, it is expected from respondent No. 3 to pass

appropriate orders in accordance with law keeping in view the order dated 13.07.2017 (Annexure P/4) as expeditiously as possible preferably within

four months from the date of receipt of such representation.

5. Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the competent authority shall be at liberty

to decide representation of the petitioner in accordance with law.