

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WRIT PETITION (S) NO.2262 OF 2019**

Santosh Otwani S/o Late Shri Mannu Bhai Otwani Aged About 41 Years  
R/o House No. 34/70, Street No. 3, Near Baba Karan Das Gurudwara,  
Katora Talab, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**...Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Finance Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Directorate Of Treasury Accountants And Pension, Through Its Director, Indrawati Bhawan, Block A, First Floor, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Additional Director Directorate Of Treasury, Accounts And Pension, Indrawati Bhawan, Block A First Floor, Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Accountant General (A And 3) Chhattisgarh, Baloda Bazar Road, Zero Point, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**... Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner	:	Shri Abhishek Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Shri Rahul Mishra, Dy. Govt. Advocate.
For Respondent No.4	:	Shri Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate.

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**29.03.2019**

1. The grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is that the petitioner who has appeared in the Chhattisgarh Subordinate Accounts Services (Departmental) Examination, Part-II, conducted between 08.08.2017 to 14.08.2017 had applied for re-evaluation of his answer sheets which was rejected by the department vide order dated 16.07.2018.
2. The present writ petition now has been filed by the petitioner stating that in case of one Seema Naik, the department has, for the reasons best known, conducted re-evaluation of her papers and subsequently she has also been granted promotion after re-evaluation. The petitioner further submits that in the light of the order passed in case of Seema Naik another similarly placed person namely Rajendra Pratap Singh had filed a writ petition WPS No.7752 of 2018 before this court which was also disposed of by this court directing the respondents to consider the case of Rajendra

Pratap Singh also in the same manner as has been done in the case of Seema Naik.

3. According to the petitioner, he also is applying for the same relief and that his application may also be considered similarly.
4. Considering the fact that the respondents on one hand have taken a stand on the case of the petitioner on 16.07.2018 that there is no provision for re-evaluation and at the same time the respondents have entertained the application for re-evaluation in case of Seema Naik, the authorities are expected to have taken the same standard and parameters for all those persons who had applied for re-evaluation. The department could not have been chosen one stand in respect of re-evaluation for some, and deny the same for others.
5. Accordingly, the present writ petition also stands disposed of directing the petitioner to make a fresh representation to the authorities concerned in the department supported with all relevant documents and records and also the orders passed in case of similarly placed persons and thereafter the competent authority in the department i.e. the respondent No.2 is expected to take a decision at the earliest on the claim of the petitioner in similar terms as has been done in cases of Seema Naik.
6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-  
(P. Sam Koshy)  
**Judge**