

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 6472 of 2017**

- Smt. Sarita Kumar W/o Shri Krishan Kumar, Aged About 27 Years Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School Ichhapur, Block Kanker, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Kanker, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Kanker, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh
4. Block Education Officer, Kanker, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh
5. Treasury Officer, Treasury, Account And Pension, Kanker, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Petitioner
For Respondents

Shri Somkant Verma, Advocate.
Shri Sameer Behar, P.L. for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****28/11/2017**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the issue involved in the present case is squarely covered by the judgment rendered by this Court in the matter of **Ku. Girija Patel vs State of Chhattisgarh and others**, passed

in WPS No. 2791 of 2017, decided on 03.07.2017, in respect of similarly situated employee, whose transfer from the jurisdiction of one Zila Panchayat to other Zila Panchayat has been held to be without jurisdiction and illegal by this court in WPS No. 1273 of 2016 (**Smt. Geeta Sukhdev Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others**) and batch of petitions, decided on 23.12.2016.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that **Ku. Girija Patel** (supra) was also one of the aggrieved employee like the petitioner, who had assailed the order of transfer from one Zila Panchayat to other Zila Panchayat, which was set aside by this Court. Later on, **Ku. Girija Patel** (supra) filed another writ petition bearing WPS No. 2791 of 2017 claiming that she is entitled to salary for the period it was not paid to her for non-joining pursuant to the impugned order of transfer. That petition has been allowed vide order dated 03.07.2017 with direction to make payment of salary with effect from the date of transfer till the date of joining.
3. Learned State counsel would not dispute the legal position and that the case of the petitioner is similar to that of **Ku. Girija Patel** (supra), in whose favour order has been passed by this Court on 03.07.2017. She, however, would submit that it would require factual verification as to the date which the petitioner joined duty.

4. In view of the aforesaid submission, I am inclined to allow this petition on the same terms as in the case of **Ku. Girija Patel** (supra) and direct the respondents to grant consequential relief including wages with effect from the date of transfer till the date, the petitioner joined her duty. Let necessary steps be taken in this regard within a period of 60 days from today.
5. The writ petition stands allowed in terms of the order passed in **Ku. Girija Patel** (supra).

Sd/-

Judge

Prashant Kumar Mishra

Akhilesh