NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 1049 of 2017

Jhadiram Sahu S/o Shri Kalanath Sahu, Aged About 56 Years Working As Office Assistant Grade- II (On Deputation Chhattisgarh State Schedule Caste & Schedule Tribe Commission) Raipur, R/o In Front Of Sindhi School, Jorapara, Jawahar Nagar Ward, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Scheduled Caste & Scheduled Tribes Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Commissioner, Tribal Scheduled Caste & Schedule Tribes Development Directorate, Indirawati Bhavan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Executive Officer/Secretary, Chhattisgarh State Haj Committee Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri NK Vyas, Advocate.
For Respondent/State : Shri Shashank Thakur, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order On Board

02/03/2017

1. The petitioner by way of this petition seeks a direction to the respondents for reconsidering the case of the petitioner in respect of the discrepancy that has been arose in fixation of pay of the petitioner in the light of periodical revision of pay that has occurred.

2. According to the petitioner, he was an employee of erstwhile MPSRTC. After creation of the State of Chhattisgarh, the services of the petitioner was placed under the Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation (for short, CIDC). That, from CIDC the petitioner was sent on deputation to Chhattisgarh Haj Committee. He is still working as Assistant

Grade-III with the said Haj Committee. The grievance of the petitioner is that he has not been properly given benefit of periodical revision of pay that has occurred and as such there is huge amount of arrears which is yet to be received by the petitioner by virtue of revision of pay.

3. He further submits that he has also made repeated request to the respondent No.3. Legal notice was also sent to the respondent No.2 in this regard, but the case of the petitioner has not been considered nor the respondent No.2 has made any efforts for re calculating/reassessing the claim of the petitioner.

4. Counsel for the State at this juncture does not oppose the request for the respondent No.2 to be directed to reconsider the claim of the petitioner by recalculating the benefit of revision of pay given to the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent No.2, that within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order, he shall issue appropriate instructions to the concerned Section in the department to recalculate the entire fixation of the petitioner in the light of the periodical revision of pay that has occurred and thereafter to pass a suitable order within a further period of 60 days.

6. Needless to mention that in case if some arrears is found payable in favour of the petitioner, the same shall be released to him forthwith without any further delay.

Sd/-
(P.Sam Koshy)
Judge

inder