

(1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT  
BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION(S) NO. 2887 OF 2014

PETITIONER:

Mukesh Kumar Prajapati, S/o-  
Shri Lala Ram Prajapati, Aged  
About- 45 Years, Lecturer  
(Suspended as Block Education  
Officer, Mainpat, District-  
Surguja), R/o- Village Uchdhi,  
Post Lamgaon, Police Station-  
Batauli, District- Surguja (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENT(S):

1. State of Chhattisgarh  
Through Principal Secretary,  
Department of Scheduled Caste  
and Scheduled Tribe  
Development, Mantralaya,  
Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya  
Raipur (C.G.)
2. Commissioner, Scheduled Caste  
and Scheduled Tribe  
Development, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Collector, Surguja, District-  
Surguja (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA



2887/14  
Presented by Shri S. Sharma  
dated 25/6/14



CA

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO.2887 OF 2014

PETITIONER

Mukesh Kumar Prajapati

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh & Others

(Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India)

Single Bench : Hon'ble Shri Prashant Kumar Mishra, J.

---

Present :- Shri Vinay Pandey, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Shri A.V. Sridhar, Panel Lawyer for the State.

---

ORDER (OPEN COURT)

(Passed on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014)

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

1. Petitioner has raised a grievance that vide order dated 8-2-2008 the petitioner was suspended under Rule 9 of the Chhattisgarh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1966 on registration of a criminal case against him for committing offence under Sections 7 & 13 (1) (d) read with Section 13 (2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, however, vide order dated 3-9-2013 (Annexure - P/4) the suspension order was revoked, but subsequently the order of revocation was cancelled on 13-9-2013 (Annexure - P/1). Petitioner's appeal against this order is pending consideration, but despite lapse of about 10 months, the appellate authority has not taken any decision in the matter.
2. At this juncture, learned counsel for the State would submit that the appellate authority would be informed to take up the appeal and decide the same as early as possible.
3. Considering the nature of controversy and pendency of appeal preferred by the petitioner, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that the appellate authority, before whom the petitioner's appeal against the order

dated 13-9-2013 is pending, shall decide the appeal as early as possible, by a reasoned order, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the appeal, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order, as opinion on the merits of the case.

Gowri

Sd/-  
**Prashant Kumar Mishra**  
Judge