

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2666 of 2015**

- Arvind Saloman Raghu S/o Sarik Samuel Raghu Aged About 61 years Posted As Vishay Vastu Visheshagya Varg-3, Office Sub- Divisional Agriculture Officer, Manendragarh, Distt. Korla, R/o. Kali Mandir Road Manendragarh, Distt. Korla (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through : The Secretary, Agriculture Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Agriculture Department, Chhattisgarh, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Joint Director, Agriculture Department, Surguja Division, District Surguja - Ambikapur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Deputy Director, Agriculture Department, Surguja Division, District Surguja- Ambikapur (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri JK Shastri, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, GA for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****28/07/2015**

1. Shri Shastri, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is working on the post of Subject Expert Grade-III (Vishay Vastu Visheshagya Varg-3) in the office of Sub-Divisional Officer (Agriculture) Manendragarh. He has been promoted on the post of Senior Agriculture Extension Officer in the year 1997 and is working on the said post since last about 18 years. In view of the State Government's circular dated 28-4-2008,

the petitioner is entitled for time bound pay-scale on completion of 10 years of service, however, despite representation preferred before respondent No.2, petitioner's prayer for grant of time bound pay-scale is not considered.

2. Learned State counsel would submit that the representation Annexure P-5 does not bear any receipt of the concerned office, wherein the same has been submitted and it appears to have been sent by the registered post, therefore, if the petitioner prefers fresh representation, the concerned authority shall be communicated for deciding the same, in accordance with law.
3. In view of the aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that in the event, the petitioner prefers a fresh representation before the respondents within a period of one month from today, the respondent authorities shall decide the same, on its own merits, within a further period of three months.
4. 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

ashu