

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No.4621 of 2017

- Geeta Ram Watti S/o Shri K R Watti Aged About 45 Years Upper Division Teacher, Govt. Middle School, Peedhapal, Kanker, District - Kanker. Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through : The Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director, Chhattisgarh Public Instruction, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Shri Radhyshyam Sahu. Lecturer, Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Balod. District- Balod Chhattisgarh.
4. Smt. Sunita Pandey. Lecturer, Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Korba. District Korba Chhattisgarh.
5. Smt. Nanda Chandra. Lecturer, Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Korba District- Korba Chhattisgarh.
6. Shri Jag Ram Yadav. Lecturer Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Korba District- Korba Chhattisgarh.
7. Shri Satyanarayan Chwodhari. Lecturer, Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Bilaspur. District- Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
8. Shri Sanjay Kumar Sen Lecturer, Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Bilaspur. District- Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
9. Shri Jitindra Prasad Tiwari. Lecturer, Working Under The Jurisdiction Of District Education Officer, Kanker District- Kanker Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Somkant Verma, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

07/09/2017

Heard.

1. The promotion of respondents No.3 to 9 stated to be junior to the petitioner has given rise petitioner's grievance, in respect of which, the petitioner has preferred representation to the respondent No.2.
2. The case of the petitioner is that he is senior to respondents No. 3 to 9 and there are no adverse remarks against him nor any punishment has been imposed on him by the authority. He submits that the criteria for promotion is seniority-cum-fitness and therefore, the petitioner ought to have been given promotion.
3. The claim of the petitioner does not appear to be frivolous. Therefore, the respondent is under an obligation to decide petitioner's application for grant of promotion w.e.f. the date when his juniors were promoted.
4. Accordingly, respondents No.2, who is stated to be the competent authority to take decision in the matter, is directed to take decision on petitioner's representation within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
5. In case, it is found that the petitioner is entitled for promotion on the basis that his juniors were promoted, necessary orders may be passed granting him promotion with consequential benefits.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the petition is finally disposed off.

SD/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge