

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 213 of 2016**

- Arjun Lal son of late Punau Ram, aged about 48 years, posted as Waterman at Harizan Pre-Metric Balak Chhatravas Bodsara, Block Bilha, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: The Secretary, Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. Assistant Commissioner, Scheduled Tribe Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. Collector, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
4. Block Education Officer, Pondi Uproda, Presently District Korba (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri A.D. Kuldeep, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Shri S.P. Kale, Dy. Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****21/01/2016**

(1) Grievance of the petitioner in the instant writ petition is that the petition along with one Keshav Prasad Koushik were appointed in the department of respondents as contingency paid employee. The dispute of the petitioner

is that the said Keshav Prasad Koushik who was appointed with the petitioner was regularized by order dated 9.9.2008 passed by respondent No. 2. However, for some reasons the same has been denied to the petitioner.

(2) Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been repeatedly approaching the respondents on this issue seeking the benefits at par with the person who had been appointed along with the petitioner but the respondents have not decided the case of the petitioner till date.

(3) State counsel, at this juncture, submits that in case the representation of the petitioner has not been decided by the respondents, the same shall be considered by the Authorities. He further submits that if the petitioner wants, he may also make a fresh representation to the respondents in respect of his grievance giving details of his claim along with documentary evidence if any, and the same shall be considered by the concerned Authorities in accordance with the rules.

(4) Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to approach the respondents

within a period of two weeks from today by making a detailed representation in respect of his claim along with documentary proofs, if any and on receipt of the same, the Authorities concerned shall take a prompt decision taking into consideration the benefits which have been granted to the similarly placed persons.

(5) This court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case the authority concerned is free to decide the representation of the petitioner on its own merit in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-