



CGHC010190122022

2026:CGHC:27680

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3965 of 2022

Vinita Singh D/o Lala Singh Aged About 33 Years R/o., Plot No. 52, Vedant Nagar, Umarpoti, Post Purai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh. Pin 491107

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Govt. Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, P.O. Rakhi, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Joint Director, Office Of Joint Director (Education) Durg, Opposite To Jilla Panchayat, G.E. Road, Durg Chhattisgarh.

3 - Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board, Through The Chairman, Chhattisgarh Professional Examination Board Raipur, Vyapam Bhavan North Block, Sector-19 Atal Nagar Chhattisgarh. 492001

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	: Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, Advocate
For State	: Mr. R.C.S. Deo, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

06.07.2026

1. By way of this petition, the petitioner has sought the following relief(s):-

“i) That the Hon'ble High Court may most kindly be pleased to call the entire records relating to the Petitioner; in the ends of justice.

ii) That the Hon'ble High Court may most kindly be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction in the

nature of mandamus or of any other appropriate nature directing the respondents to give another opportunity to the petitioner to get her documents (educational documents) verified by the respondent authorities and to include the petitioner in the process of selection/appointment for the post of Teacher Mathematics (T cadre) in Durg Division, in the ends of justice.

iii) That, as an alternative the Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No. 1 to decide the representation dated 19.05.2022 made by the petitioner in the ends of justice.

iv) That, the Hon'ble High Court may kindly grant any other relief or/and alternative relief to the petitioner which is deemed proper, just and fit in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the ends of justice.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied for the post of Teacher - Mathematics (T Cadre) pursuant to the advertisement issued by respondent No.3 in the year 2019. He submits that after examination of the said post, the petitioner was called upon to appear for verification of documents between 06.05.2022 and 13.05.2022. However, the communication in this regard was served upon the petitioner on 15.05.2022. It is contended that on account of the negligence of the respondent authorities, the petitioner could not appear for document verification and was deprived of appointment despite being a selected candidate. Therefore, it is prayed that the respondents be directed to consider the petitioner's candidature for appointment.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents No.1 and 2 submits that the petitioner was subsequently afforded another opportunity to appear for verification of documents. He submits that the petitioner was informed on 15.09.2022 and, pursuant thereto, she appeared before the concerned authority on 19.09.2022. Learned counsel further contends that after verification it was found that the petitioner had secured less than 50% marks in graduation and was not eligible for appointment accordingly, her candidature was rejected by order dated 19.09.2022. It is further submitted that although the return was filed on 03.08.2023 wherein the order dated 19.09.2022 has been annexed as Annexure R-3, but the petitioner has neither challenged the said order nor questioned the finding regarding her non eligibility. Therefore, no relief can be granted in the present writ petition and the same deserves to be dismissed.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.
5. From perusal of the return filed by the State, it is clear that although the petitioner could not appear for document verification on the earlier scheduled dates, she was again granted an opportunity and accordingly appeared before the concerned authority on 19.09.2022. Upon verification of her documents, the concerned authority found that the petitioner had secured less than 50% marks in graduation and was, therefore, not eligible for appointment in terms of the Recruitment Rules, 2019. Consequently, her candidature was rejected by order dated 19.09.2022.
6. Having considered the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that since the petitioner's candidature has already

been considered and rejected by the concerned authority, and the said order dated 19.09.2022 has not been challenged by the petitioner, no interference is called for in the present writ petition.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

\$. Bhilwar