

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 1943 of 2015

- S. N. Prasad S/o Late Khedan Ram, Aged About 72 years, R/o Gandhi Nagar, Near Dairy Form, Ambikapur, Police Station And Post Ambikapur, Civil & Revenue District Surguja (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Tribal Welfare Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, New Raipur District Raipur (C.G.)
2. Commissioner, Tribal Welfare, Chhattisgarh, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
3. Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Welfare, Surguja District Surguja (C.G.)
4. Collector (Tribal Welfare) Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Vikrama Dixit, Advocate
For Respondent/State	: Shri P.K. Bhaduri, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board By

02/07/2015

1. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the subject matter of the present petition is similar to the batch of writ petitions, in the matter of ***S.B. Tripathi and Others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Another*** in ***W.P.(S) No. 4421/2008*** and other connected writ petitions decided on 08/03/2013. He submits that a similar order may be passed in the present case also.

2. State counsel submits that the petitioner has approached this Court directly without moving any representation seeking parity with the above referred matters, however, if the petitioner submits a representation claiming his relief on the ground of parity, the same shall be examined and his representation shall be decided by the competent authority in accordance with law.

3. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a directed that in the event the petitioner submits a representation before the competent authority seeking relief on the ground of parity with the above referred matter of ***S.B. Tripathi and Others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Another*** (supra), the competent authority shall examine the matter and if petitioner's case is similar to the case of above writ petitioners, his representation shall be decided in accordance with law by a speaking order, within a period of three months from the date of submission of the representation.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not observed anything on merits of the case and it would be entirely up to the competent authority to pass order in accordance with law.

Sd/-

JUDGE

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)