

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 1309 of 2017

- Pratiksha Mohgaonkar W/o Abhay Mohgaonkar Aged About 48 Years
Substantively Working As Principal, Currently Working As In-Charge-Officer,
Pre Examination Training Centre, Department Of Tribal Welfare, District-
Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Tribal Welfare,
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Additional Director, Pre- Examination Training Centre Department Of Tribal
Welfare, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Commissioner, Department Of Tribal Welfare, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Chandradeep Prasad, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Manish Nigam, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

09/08/2017

Despite last opportunity granted to the learned State counsel, no reply has been filed.

2. Learned State counsel again prays for short time to file reply.
3. As last opportunity had already been granted to the learned State counsel to file reply, prayer for grant of further time cannot be accepted.
4. The petitioner is claiming salary on the ground that he was working as Lecturer and was entitled to salary and appropriate pay scale on the basis of order dated 22-09-2016 passed by the respondents. It is the case of the petitioner, stated on affidavit, to which, there is no counter-affidavit filed, that the salary of the petitioner is not being paid, because of the reason that in a writ petition filed by one Asha William,

there is an interim order passed by this Court.

5. After going through the records and the petitioner's own showing that the main operative reason for not paying salary because of the interim order passed by this Court in other pending writ petition, in which, the petitioner has already moved an application for being impleaded as one of the respondents and as the application is still pending consideration without any decision, a separate petition touching upon the same issue, as involved in the other writ petition, cannot be gone into separately in this writ petition.

6. Accordingly, the petition is therefore, dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to pursue her application for being impleaded as one of the respondents in the other pending writ petition. The petitioner would be at liberty to revive, in case, occasion so arises.

SD/-
(**Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**)
Judge