2026:CGHC:5418

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 312 of 2025

Managing Director Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation Chhattisgarh Rajya Kaushal Vikas Pradhikaran Bhawan, Second Floor, Old P.H.Q. Campus, Near Raj Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh (Respondent No. 3)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1. Vipin Chourasiya S/o Tulsiram Chourasiya Aged About 38 Years R/o Lig J/14, Ward No. 32, Dindayal Awas, Housing Board Colony, Near Pani Tanki, Rampur, Korba, District Korba Chhattisgarh

2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Water Resource Department, Mantralay, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

3. Collector District Office, Korba, District Korba Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Malay Shrivastava, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Anand Gupta, Dy. G.A.
For Respondent No. 1	:	Mr. Anirudha Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

31/01/2026

1. The review petitioner in the present review seeks review/ recall the order dated 11.04.2025 passed in WPS No. 2480 of 2025.

2. (a) Learned counsel appearing for the review petitioner/ CIDC submits that the writ petitioner in his writ petition has suppressed the material facts. He would submit that the bread winner of the writ petitioner died 5-6 years back and the application moved by the writ petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment has been rejected by the competent authorities on the ground of lack of requisite qualifications and the same has duly been communicated.

   (b) According to the learned counsel though the review petitioner represented before this court while hearing the writ petition, but on account of lack of instructions he could not place the relevant facts before this court and accordingly the writ petition, which is under review, was disposed off by this court at motion stage.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner/respondent herein would submit that they have not suppressed any material fact. He would submit that the alleged rejection of earlier representation has never been communicated to the writ petitioner.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the pleadings and documents.

5. From bare perusal, it is manifest that though while hearing the writ petition under review the CIDC was properly represented on advance copy, however, due to lack of proper instructions he could not place anything. However, the writ petition was disposed off directing the Chief Secretary to the State Government to look into the grievance and claim of the writ petitioner afresh.

6. Be that as it may, now the review petitioner bringing several facts and orders/ circular issued by the authorities with regard to the policy framed regarding grant of compassionate appointment preferred the present review petition, which was not brought before this court at the time of hearing of writ petition, hence, the review petition is **allowed.**

7. Consequently, the order passed in WPS No. 2480 of 2025 is hereby recalled and the said writ petition is restored to its original number.

Sd/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
JUDGE

Jyoti