

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2101 of 2015**

- Subal Sai Painkra, aged about 55 years, Son of Late Mangna Ram @ Mangna Sai, occupation- Upper Division Teacher, presently working as - Head Master, Government Middle School- Rajkot, Block and Tahsil- Dharamjaigarh (Wrongly Mentioned Lailunga), Civil and Revenue District- Raigarh (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Tribal, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Secretary, Department of School Education, New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
3. The Asst. Commissioner, Department of Tribal, Raigarh (C.G.)
4. The District Education Officer, District- Raigarh (C.G.)
5. The Block Education Officer, Department of Tribal, Block- Dharamjaigarh (Wrongly Mentioned Lailunga), Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri AN Bhakta, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, GA for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****18/06/2015**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that although he had earlier preferred a similar writ petition WP (S) 1141/2015, which was disposed of on 1-4-2015 and the said order would have served the purpose, however, on account of mistake in description of the petitioner and respondent No.5,

he preferred an MCC for correction, which was dismissed as withdrawn, as this Court was of the view that the petitioner is required to file fresh writ petition.

2. In the earlier writ petition, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is entitled to get the benefit of two advance increments on account of completion of his B.Ed. Examination after appointment at his own expenses. He submits that case of the petitioner is squarely covered with the decision of the Apex Court in the matter of **Asha Saxena V. State of M.P. & C.G. 2009 (III) MPJR (SC) 59**. At this stage, counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to pursue his claim before the competent authority and a direction may also be issued for deciding his representation.

State counsel has no objection to the proposition made by the counsel for the petitioner.

Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn. If the petitioner makes any representation detailing his grievances, the same may be decided as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of three months from today.”

3. Since an order has already been passed in the above terms in petitioner's earlier writ petition, a fresh order is not necessary. The aforesaid order shall remain applicable in favour of the petitioner.
4. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

JUDGE

ashu