

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR
WP (S) No. 339 OF 2016

1. Chaut Ram Tandan S/o Shri Muni Ram Tandan, aged about 42 years, Teacher Panchayat, Govt. Middle School, R/o Village-Miriguda, Block Dharamjaigarh, District-Raigarh
2. Chaitanand Rathiya S/o Jugalkishor Ratiya, aged about 41 years, R/o Gala Block Pattalgaon, District Jashpur

---Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department of School Education, New Mantralaya, Raipur C.G.
2. Director, Tribal Development Department, Raipur
3. Commissioner, Schedule Tribe and Schedule Caste Development Department, Raipur C.G.
4. Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh C.G.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat, Raigarh, District Raigarh C.G.
6. District Education Officer, District Raigarh
7. Block Education Officer Block Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh C.G.
8. N.S.D.L. (National Securities Depository Limited) Head Office Mumbai Address Trade World, A Wing 4th and 5th Floors, Kamala Mills Compound, Lower Parel, Mumbai-400013.

---Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. K.K.Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Dhiraj K. Wankhede, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

03/02/2016

1. The petitioners have filed this petition, aggrieved by communications dated 19.2.2014 and 21.2.2014 by which the petitioners are being compelled to fill-up forms for being used for

issuance of PRAN Card.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that while filling-up forms, the petitioners are being compelled to declare a date different than the actual date of joining in service.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that such requirement of recording 1st April, 2014 as the date of joining is only for limited purpose of preparing e-records and issuance of PRAN Card and the order itself is very clear that it will not have any effect on the correct and actual date of appointment in service.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, taking into consideration the clear stipulation in the impugned communications particularly the submission made by learned counsel for the State, apprehension, if any in the mind of the petitioners, should not be there any more. It is made clear that such an entry made in the concerned forms will be for the limited purpose as communicated in the impugned communications and it will not affect any of the right of the petitioners and for all legal purpose, the date of entry into service as has already been recorded in the service records, seniority list which exists on today, alone shall be considered.

5. With the aforesaid observations, the petition is finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
JUDGE

B/-