

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 684 of 2018**

Kumari Selestina Ekka, D/o Agastush Ekka, aged about 59 years, Working as Head Master at Govt. Middle School Kudkai, Block Pendra, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. Block Education Officer, Block Pendra, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****18/01/2018**

With consent, learned counsel for the parties were heard finally.

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents to pay two advance increments from the date of passing of B.Ed examination, on her own expenses, during her service period.
2. Shri Shrivastava, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the issue involved in the present case is no longer *res integra* as the same has been considered and decided by the Supreme Court in *Asha Saxena v. State of M.P. & Ors.*¹ as well as by this Court in the matter of *Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj v. Municipal Corporation, Durg & another*² and *Gopesh Kumar Verma v. The State Govt. of Chhattisgarh and another*³.

1 2009 (II) MPJR (SC) 59

2 2006 (II) MPJR-CG 96

3 WP(S) No. 4130 of 2005

3. Shri Shrivastava further submits that the instant petition is squarely covered by the decision as aforestated. Thus, the petitioner may be permitted to make a representation to decide his case in the light of aforestated decision, subject to verification of the fact as to whether the petitioner has acquired B.Ed certificate on her own expenses during the course of her service.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the State / respondents submits that in the event, the petitioner makes a representation, the same will be considered and decided, in accordance with law and in the light of the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Asha Saxena* (supra) as well as this Court in *Yashwan Kumar Bharadwaj* and *Gopesh Kumar Verma* (supra), within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the representation.
5. In view of foregoing, according to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, nothing survives in this petition for adjudication.
6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

SD/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge