

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.6464 of 2016**

Dr. Shrikant Shukla S/o B.P. Shukla, Aged About 64 Years R/o
Sadar Bazar, Bhatapara, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara
Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Health And Family Welfare Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Commissioner, Health Services, Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Director, Health Services, Chhattisgarh Indravati Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Medical And Health Officer, Mahasamund, District Hospital Premises, Mahasamund, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Surgeon-cum-Chief Hospital Superintendent, District Hospital, Mahasamund, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate
For State	: Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order On Board

29/11/2016**(1)** Heard.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is working on the post of Eye Specialist in District Hospital, Mahasamund and non practicing allowance is not being given to him as per circular dated 02.06.2016 issued by the State Government, against which, he has made several representation before the

respondents authorities for redressal of his grievance but till now, no decision has been taken by the respondents authorities and, therefore, direction may be issued to the respondents No.1, 2 & 3 to decide the same expeditiously.

(3) Prayer appears to be fair and reasonable.

(4) Be that as it may, respondents No.1, 2 & 3 are directed to consider and take a decision on the pending representation of the petitioner for grant of non practicing allowance as per circular dated 02.06.2016 issued by the State Government expeditiously from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

(5) It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondents authorities may decide the representation on its own merits.

(6) With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

L/-