



NAFR

HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 1747 of 2023

- Smt. Neeta Verma W/o Balram Chandrakar Aged About 43 Years Working As Lecturer (L.B.) At Government Higher Secondary School, Gatora, Block Masturi, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

-----Petitioner

VERSUS

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Department of Panchayat And Rural Development Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Commissioner Cum Director, Directorate Of Panchayat Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
5. District Education Officer, Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
6. Block Education Officer, Masturi, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

-----Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Govind Dewangan, Advocate

For Respondent-State : Ms. Ruchi Nagar, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER

10/03/2023

1. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that pursuant to the order passed in ***Mukesh Kumar Patel and another vs. State of C.G. and another*** in **WPS No. 2530 of 2017** petitioner is also entitled for the revised pay scale after completion of 08 years of service from the date of initial appointment, however, petitioner has not been extended benefit of revised pay scale till date.
2. Learned State Counsel submits that petitioner has not submitted any application/ representation raising her grievance before Respondent No. 4 who is the appointing authority of petitioner.
3. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioner would submit that



petitioner may be permitted to submit a fresh representation before Respondent No. 4 and in turn Respondent No. 4 be directed to consider and decide the representation of petitioner expeditiously within specified time.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the documents annexed along with writ petition.

5. Considering the submission of learned counsel for petitioner and also facts and circumstances of the case, without entering into the merits, I find it appropriate to dispose of this writ petition at this stage permitting the petitioner to submit detailed representation raising all grounds as raised in this writ petition before Respondent No. 4 and further directing Respondent No. 4 to consider and decide the same at the earliest.

6. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of permitting petitioner to submit detailed representation alongwith relevant documents before Respondent No. 4, and if such representation is submitted by the petitioner, Respondent No. 4 shall consider and decide the same expeditiously preferably within an outer limit of **four months** from the date of receipt of representation, in accordance with law, keeping in mind the decision of this Hon'ble court in cases of **Mukesh Kumar Patel** (supra).

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge