



NAFR

HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 1352 of 2023

- Priyanka Tiwari W/o Birendra Tiwari Aged About 35 Years Working as Rural Health Coordinator (Female), Sub-Health Centre, Bend, Community Health Centre, Bagicha, District - Jashpur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Health & Family Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Director Directorate Of Health Services, Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan Third Floor, Block - 1, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, District - Raipur (C.G.)
3. The Deputy Director Directorate Of Health Services Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan Thrid Floor, Block - 1, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, District - Raipur (C.G.)
4. The Chief Medical And Health Officer District - Jashpur (C.G.)
5. Sanjay Kumar Working As Rural Health Coordinator (Male), Sub-Health Centre, Ghaghra, District Jashpur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Sahu, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Shubham Verma, Panel Lawyer

S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Order On Board

15/02/2023

1. Grievance of petitioner in this writ petition is that her junior has been selected for two years training of Ophthalmic Assistant Officer ahead of her.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner is working as Rural Health Coordinator (Female) since 16.3.2011 and respondent No.5 is working since 12.8.2016, as is evident from letter dated



12.12.2022 written by respondent No.4 to respondent No.3 for grant of permission to take admission in training course of Assistant Ophthalmic Officer and in which name of petitioner is at Sr. No.2 and name of respondent No.5 is at Sr. No.7. Petitioner was hopeful of her selection but by order dated 29.11.202 (Annexure P-1) respondent No.5, who is much junior to petitioner, has been selected for training course ahead of petitioner. Aggrieved with arbitrary action on the part of respondents, petitioner immediately submitted representation before respondent No.2 on 3.1.2023 but till date no decision is taken on it. He submits that at this stage grievance of petitioner would get redressed if a direction is issued to respondent No.2 to consider and decide petitioner's pending representation at the earliest within specific time.

3. Learned State Counsel submits that he is having no objection to the limited prayer made by learned counsel for petitioner
4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
5. Considering entire facts and circumstances of case and limited prayer made by learned counsel for petitioner, which is not opposed by State Counsel, this writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No.2 to consider and decide pending representation of petitioner dated 3.1.2023 (Annexure P-4) expeditiously preferably within an outer limit of three weeks from the date of receipt of this order.
6. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge