

# IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT

# **BILASPUR**

W.P. (S) No. 6835 /2011

**PETITIONER** 

Udho Prasad Sharma, S/o Late Shri Samaran Prasad Sharma, aged about 57 years, R/o Quarter no. 645, Deen Dayal Upadhyay Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

### **VERSUS**

**1.** 

2.

**RESPONDENTS**:

State of Chhattisgarh,

Through: Secretary, Department of Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection, DKS Bhawan, Mantralya, Raipur, (C.G.)

Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation, Raipur (C.G.) through its Managing Director, Hitwad Parisar Awanti Vihar, Telibhanda, Raipur C.G.

General Manager, Administration Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation, Hitwad Parisar Awanti Vihar, Raipur.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA





### HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

(Hon. Mr. Justice Pritinker Diwaker) W.P.S. No. 6835 of 2011

**Petitioner** 

**Udho Prasad Sharma** 

#### **VERSUS**

# Respondent

State of Chhattisgarh & others

Present:

Shri Sourabh Dangi, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Shashank Thakur, PL for the State/respondent

No.1.

Shri V.R. Tiwari, counsel for the respondents No.2 & 3

on advance copy.

#### ORDER (21.11.2011)

The grievance of the petitioner is that on 31.07.2008, he was suspended and thereafter on 12.11.2008, learned Sessions Court framed charge against him under Sections 407 and 120-B of IPC but till date, the trial has not been concluded and as per the circular issued by the General Administration Department, suspension order ought to have been revoked.

- 2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the purpose of filing this petition would be served if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to decide the pending representation of the petitioner (Annexure P-5).
- 3. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that let the petitioner make a fresh detailed representation to respondent No.2 and the same would be decided in accordance with law.
- 4. The present petition is accordingly disposed of. In the eventuality of filing of any such representation by the petitioner within a period of two weeks from today, the same would be decided by the respondent No.2 within a further period of four weeks.
- 5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the authority concerned would be at liberty to decide the representation strictly in accordance with law.

Sd/-Pritinker Diwaker - Judge