

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 1944 of 2015**

- T. P. Prajapati, S/o late Kashi Prasad Prajapati, aged near about 67 years R/o. Wadranagar, Balrampur, Police Station and Post Balrampur, Civil and Revenue District Balrampur- Ramanujganj (CG)

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

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

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate.
 For Respondents : Shri YS Thakur, Deputy Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****16/07/2015**

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 WP(S) No.4421/2008 and other connected writ petitions decided on 8.3.2013. He submits that a similar order may be passed in the present case also.
2. Learned 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 direction 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** (Supra), the competent authority shall examine the matter and if the 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)

Barve