

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2344 of 2015

Tulsi Ram Verma, S/O Matthu Lal Verma Aged About 52 years Working
As Upper Division Teacher Govt. Middle School Khairtal, Block Baloda
Bazar District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Education Department,
D.K.S. Bhawan Mantralaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director Public Instructions Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Deputy Director Public Instructions Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. District Education Officer, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar
Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	Shri C.J.K. Rao, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Shri Sangarsh Pandey, Dy GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

01/07/2015

1. The petitioner is working as Upper Division Teacher, he is aggrieved by his supersession in the matter of promotion to the post of Lecturer (Sanskrit).
2. According to learned counsel for the petitioners, number of juniors have been promoted and despite representation being filed by the petitioner, his grievance has not been paid heed to. He would submit that the petitioner has not earned any adverse remark, nor any enquiry

is pending against him, therefore, non-consideration of his case for promotion is arbitrary.

3. Learned counsel would further submit that for the present, the petitioner may be permitted to make fresh representation and the respondents be directed to decide the same at the earliest, so that the petitioner is aware as to the reason for denial of promotion.
4. Learned State counsel would submit that if fresh representation is filed, the same shall be considered and decided, in accordance with law.
5. In view of the foregoing, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that in the event, the petitioner submits a fresh representation within a period of one month from today, the competent authority shall consider and decide the same by a speaking order, in accordance with law, on its own merits, within a further period of three months.
6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the matter, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order, as opinion on the merits of the case

Sd/-

JUDGE

PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA

Nirala