



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 81 of 2023**

Damrudhar Ratre S/o Shri Tajao Ram Ratre Aged About 49 Years Presently Working As Lecturer (L.B.) At Government Higher Secondary School, Kunkuni, Block Kharsiya, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Commissioner-Cum-Director Directorate of Panchayat, Atal Nagar Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Director Directorate School Education Department, Indrawati Bhawan, Nava Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat, Raigarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
5. District Education Officer Raigarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Mr. CJK Rao, Advocate.

For State : Mr. Ravi Bhagat, GA.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu**Order on Board****11/01/2023**

1. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner was initially appointed on the post of 'Shiksha karmi Grade-II' on 23.06.2005. Subsequently, he was appointed on the post of 'Shiksha karmi Grade-I' vide order dated 11.12.2010. As per notification issued by State Government dated 17.05.2013 wherein, Teacher (Panchayat) who have completed 8 years of service are entitled for revised pay scale. In order dated 29.12.2018, (Annexure P-2), it is mentioned that date of completion of eight years of service of petitioner as 23.06.2013, but benefit of revised pay-scale is extended from date of order ie 29.12.2018 and not from the date of his entitlement ie 23.06.2013. Petitioner is entitle for arrears of revised pay-scale from the date when he became entitle. He places reliance upon decision in case of WPS No.2530 of 2017 (**Mukesh Kumar Patel and another versus State of Chhattisgarh and another**). He also referred to order passed by co-ordinate Bench of this Court in WPS No. 5328 of 2021



(**Avinesh Kumar Namdev and Ors. Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Ors**). He further contended that, grievance of petitioner would be redressed if petitioner may be permitted to submit representation before respondent No.4 and In-turn respondent No.4 be directed to consider and decide the same within specified time.

2. Learned State Counsel submits that in view of submission of counsel for petitioner that representation to be considered and decided by respondent No. 4, he is having no objection.
3. Heard learned counsel for respective parties.
4. Considering entire facts and circumstances of case, submissions of counsel for respective parties, documents placed on record, I am of the view that no useful purpose would be served in keeping this writ petition pending, awaiting response of respondents, and ends of justice will be served if this writ petition is disposed of permitting petitioner to submit representation before respondent No.4 to be decided at the earliest.
5. Accordingly, this writ petition stands disposed of permitting petitioner to submit representation before respondent No.4 raising all ground as raised in this writ petition. On making such representation, respondent No.4 shall consider and decide the same in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably within an outer limit of '**six weeks**' from the date of receipt of copy of representation, keeping in mind orders passed in **Mukesh Kumar Patel** (supra) and **Avinesh Kumar Namdev** (Supra).

CC as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

J/-