

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 3351 of 2015**

1. Pramod Kumar Verma, S/o. Shankar Lal Soni, Aged About 50 Years, Presently Posted as Lecturer, Govt. Higher Secondary School, Gharghoda, Distt. Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Smt. Maithili Barik, W/o. Dr. Ranjit Kumar Barik, Aged About 46 Years, Presently Posted as Principal, Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School, Block Tamnar, Distt. Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department Of Tribal Welfare, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office & Police Station- Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office & Police Station- Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Commissioner, Department Of S.C./S.T. Development, Chhattisgarh, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Collector (Tribal Development Branch), Raigarh, District Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. B.D.Guru, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Mr. S.C.Khakharia, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****16.09.2015**

1. Heard on admission.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner No.1, Pramod Kumar Verma, appointed as Upper Division Teacher on 22.12.1986 and thereafter he passed M.Sc. In the year 1994 and was promoted to the post of

Lecturer on 04.06.2007. Subsequently, he completed his B.Ed. in the year 2015 after obtaining permission from the authority. Likewise, the petitioner No.2, Smt. Maithili Barik, was appointed on 19.11.1992 as Lecturer and thereafter promoted to the post of Principal on 08.11.2007 and she completed B.Ed. after obtaining permission from the authority in the year 2005.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that as per the law laid down in case of **Asha Saxena v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Others**, reported in **MPJR 2009 (II) SC 59**, wherein it was directed that as per circular dated 21.09.1974 the persons who acquired the B.Ed. qualification would be entitled to the benefit of two increments and the respondent State thereafter on 24.12.1998 had issued a circular that the person who passed out B.Ed. on their own expenses shall also be entitled for the increments. It is contended that the petitioners though has passed B.Ed., they have not been provided necessary increments as per the circular dated 24.12.1998.
4. In view of the facts involved in this case, at this stage, it is directed that the petitioners shall make a detailed representation to the Respondent No.3 and in case the representation is filed, the Respondent No.3/Commissioner shall be obliged to decide the said representation within a further period of three months with a detailed order. The petitioners thereafter if at all aggrieved shall be at liberty to approach this Court.
5. With such direction, the petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
JUDGE