

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.580 of 2017**

1. S.K.Mishra S/o Late K. P. Mishra, Aged About 60 Years Presently Posted As Assistant Director (Statistics) At The Office Of Joint Director Veterinary Services, District Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. S. H. Haidari, S/o Late Masum Ali Haidari, Aged About 60 Years Presently Posted As Assistant Director (Statistics) At The Office Of Joint Director Veterinary Services District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: Secretary, Department Of Veterinary Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Secretary, Finance Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Director, Veterinary Services, Chhattisgarh Capital Complex, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

--- Respondents

For Petitioners : Shri A.K. Yadav, Advocate
 For State : Shri Dhiraj Wankhede, Govt. Advocate

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

3/02/2017**(1)** Heard.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are working as Assistant Director (Statistics) in the Department of Veterinary Service for which they are not being paid higher pay scale by the respondent authorities though the other similar employees posted in other department have been granted higher pay

scale, therefore, they are also entitled to get higher pay scale against which, they have made representations before respondent authorities, which has not been considered and decided till this date and therefore, appropriate direction may be issued to the competent authority to decide the same expeditiously.

(3) Prayer appears to be fair and reasonable.

(4) Be that as it may, respondents No.1 & 2 are directed to consider and take a decision upon the pending representations of the petitioners in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order. However, the petitioners are at liberty to file additional representation, if any before respondents No.1 & 2 for redressal of their grievances.

(5) It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merit of the case and the respondent authorities would be at liberty to decide the representations of the petitioners in accordance with law.

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

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

L/-