Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
		BEFORE
		HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. JUSTICE BARIN GHOSH
14.	10.06.10	Present : Petitioner in person.
		Mr. J. B. Pradhan, Addl. Advocate General with Mr. Karma Thinlay Namgyal, Govt. Advocate and Mr. Santosh K. Chettri, Asstt. Govt. Advocate, Mr. D. K. Siwakoti, andMs. Sunita Pradhan, Advocates for the respondent nos.1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10.
		Mr. A. K. Upadhyaya, Senior Advocate with Mr. Dhurba Tewari, Advocate for the respondent nos.3, 6 and 7.

		Respondent Board is a Body Corporate, constituted
		by and under The Sikkim Khadi and Village Industries
		Board Act, 1996. In terms of Section 3 of the Act,
		respondent Board is a Body Corporate having perpetual
		succession and entitled to sue and be sued in its
		corporate name. Respondent Board, in accordance with
		Section 4 of the Act, is made of members named therein,
:		to be appointed by Government. One of the members
		named in Section 4 of the Act, is Executive Officer of the
		Board. Writ petitioner was appointed by Government as
		Executive Officer of the Board. Subsequently, by an
		ordinance, the words 'Executive Officer' occurring in the
		Act was replaced by the words 'Chief Executive Officer'.
		At that stage, writ petitioner approached this Court, but
		when the said writ petition was heard and decided, it was
Da.		noticed that the ordinance has lapsed. Court, therefore,

Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
		did not go into the challenge thrown to the ordinance and
		concluded the matter by keeping the status quo as to the
		status of the petitioner intact. Subsequent thereto, by an
		Act, what was attempted to be done by the said
		ordinance, has been done, and, accordingly, the words
		Executive Officer' occurring in the Act have been
		changed by the words 'Chief Executive Officer'.
		Petitioner contends that by reason thereof his status is
		now in Limbo, for there is no post where he can be
		accommodated. In addition to that, it is the contention
		of petitioner that the manner in which the amendment
		has been effected, takes away his erstwhile recognised
		right of being Member Secretary of the Board. In the
		event, legislature decides that some one else shall be
Ì		Member Secretary, a person who was Member Secretary
		pursuant to an earlier decision of legislature, cannot
		question the wisdom of legislature to change the person
		to be appointed as Member Secretary. In as much as,
		petitioner was Executive Officer of the Board, and, as
		such, Member Secretary thereof, it is not binding on the
	•	Government to appoint petitioner as the Chief Executive
		Officer of the Board and consequentially to permit him to
		continue to function as Member Secretary of the Board
7		after legislature by the amendment directed that it shall
By.	j	be the Chief Executive Officer who shall be Member
		Secretary of the Board.

Q

Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
		2. However, there being no expressed or implied
		decision on the part of legislature or of Government to do
		away the services of petitioner, it was incumbent on the
		part of Board to accommodate petitioner by taking
		recourse to Section 14 of the Act, and thereby to create
ŀ		at least a post of Executive Officer, after the
		aforementioned amendment came into effect, in order to
		accommodate petitioner in that post. That has not been
		done. Before the amendment no post of Executive Officer
		could be created as the said post was created by
		legislature and Section 14 only permitted creation of
		other posts.
		3. I, accordingly, dispose of this writ petition by
		directing respondent Board to take recourse to Section
		14 of the Act for the purpose of creation of at least a post
		of Executive Officer and to accommodate the petitioner in
		the said post. The above exercise be completed as
		quickly as possible, but not later than three months from
'		today. Until such time the post is thus created and the
		same is supplied by petitioner, the status of petitioner as
		declared by this Court and directed to continue by its
		previous judgment and order shall continue. Chief Justice 10.06.2010
<u>/at</u>		