# CS-5001

### Single Bench

## (W)

#### IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

### W.P. (S) NO. 4703 /2009

#### **PETITIONERS**



- 1] Durgesh Mishra S/o. R.N. Mishra, Aged about 31 years, R/o. Deepak Dairy, Nehru Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG)
- 2] Krishna Pratap Singh, S/o. Sanman Singh, Aged about 27 years, R/o. HD 08, Sector 2, Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur (CG)
- 3] Ku. Anjana Kushwaha, D/o. Bhagwat Prasad Kushwaha, Aged about <u>28</u> years, R/o. Godpara, Arya Samaj Mandir, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG)
- 4] Anand Kumar Borkar, S/o. Govind Borkar, Aged about <u>27</u> years, R/o. Nayapara, Kirtinagar, Sirgitti, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur ((CG))
- 5] Ku. Shipra Jha, D/o. Late Shri Yatindra Kumar Jha, Aged about 34 years, R/o. Sonpur Road, Narayanpur, District Narayanpur (CG)

#### **VERSUS**

#### RESPONDENTS

//

- 1] State of Chhattisgarh through: Secretary, Home Department (Public Prosecution Directorate), D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur District Raipur (CG)
- 2] Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, through: Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Raipur District Raipur (CG)
- 3] Exam Controller, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Raipur (CG)

# WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA





## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR Writ Petition (S) No. 4703 of 2009

Petitioners

Durgesh Mishra & others

Versus

Respondents

State of Chhattisgarh & others

(Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India) (SB: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri J.)

Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Yashwant Singh Thakur, Deputy Advocate General for the respondent No. 1.

Shri D. L. Dewangan, Advocate for the respondents No. 2 & 3.

#### ORDER (oral)

( Passed on this  $29^{\text{th}}\,\text{day}$  of January, 2010 ) Heard.

- Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that by
  way of this writ petition the petitioners have sought a direction
  to fix the date for interview. The date for interview has already
  been fixed by the respondents from 4th to 12th March, 2010.
   Thus, nothing survives in this petition for adjudication.
- 2. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection.
- In view of the foregoing, the writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Thakur

Sd/-Satish K. Agnihotri Judge