

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 3686 of 2015**

Panmeshwar Kumar Yadu, aged 44 Years, S/o Shri Bahor Singh, U.D.T.,
Govt. Middle School, Chaurel, Block Gunderdehi, Distt. Balod (C.G.)

---Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through- the Secretary, School Education Department, P.S. Rakhi, New Raipur (C.G.)
2. District Education Officer, Balod (C.G.)
3. Block Education Officer, Gunderdehi, Distt. Balod, P.S. Gunderdehi (C.G.)

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Varun Sharma, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order on Board****26/11/2015**

(1) By this petition, the petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents to pay two advance increments on passing of D.Ed. examination; on his own cost, after seeking permission from the department.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the issue involved in the present case is no longer *res integra* as the same has been considered and decided by the Supreme Court in ***Asha Saxena Vs. State of M.P. & others***¹ as well as by this Court in ***Yashwant Kumar Bhardwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation***² and ***Gopesh Kumar Verma Vs. The State Govt. of Chhattisgarh and another***³.

1 2009 (III) MPJR (SC) 59

2 2006 (II) MPJR-CG 96

3 WP (S) No.4310 of 2005

(3) Learned counsel further submits that the instant petition is squarely covered by the decision as aforestated. Thus, the petitioner may be permitted to make a representation to the respondents to decide his case for grant of two increments in the light of aforestated decisions, subject to verification of the facts.

(4) Learned State Counsel appearing for the State/respondents submits that in the event, the petitioner makes a representation, the same will be considered and decided, in accordance with law in the light of decision of the Supreme Court in Asha Saxena (Supra) as well as this Court in Yashwant Kumar Bhardwaj (supra) and Gopesh Kumar Verma (supra), within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the representation.

(5) In view of foregoing, according to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, nothing survives in this petition for adjudication.

(6) Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-