

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 3853 of 2007**

Kedarnath Parashar, S/o. Shri Babulal Parashar, Aged about 47 years, Presently working as Assistant Project Officer, District Panchayat, Khandva, District Khandva, Madhya Pradesh, R/o. T-5, Krishna Heights E-8, Gulmohar Colony, Opp. Rajeev Gandhi College, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary (Agriculture), D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director (Agriculture), Directorate of Agriculture, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Labhandi, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Deputy Director (Agriculture), Kanker, District Kanker Chhattisgarh
4. Farmer's Training Centre, Raipur Chhattisgarh, through: its Principal.

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Sumit Singh Rathore, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. R.N. Pusty, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****11/12/2018**

1. The substantial grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that the petitioner has not been paid the salary and other allowances, which he was entitled for, for the month of April, 2001.
2. The facts of the case is that the petitioner was working as an Assistant Director, at Government Agriculture Zone at Pakhanjur, Kanker, where the services of the petitioner was on deputation. The petitioner was later on relieved to join to his parent department on 23.04.2001 and his LPC in this regard also was released.
3. Grievance of the petitioner is that since had returned to his parent department, but for the period of April, 2001, he has not been paid his salary and allowances to the tune of Rs. 65,925/-.

4. The State Government while filing the reply have categorically stated that from the record, it appears that the department in turn has to recover an amount of Rs. 33,282/- as arrears from the petitioner, and of this, an amount of Rs.12,306/- has already been realized and there is yet a balance of approximately Rs.21,000/- to be recovered from the petitioner, and therefore the account could not be settled. It was further the contention of the petitioner that so far as payment of Rs.65,000/- is concerned, the petitioner has allegedly released the same without any authority, sanction or approval from the higher authorities and that he also did not have the drawing disbursing power.
5. Given the said nature of dispute, which is reflected from the pleadings of the petitioner as well as the respondents, this Court is of the opinion that the matter can be resolved in the event, if it is properly scrutinized by the higher authorities in the department.
6. Given the facts, let the petitioner make a detailed representation in respect of his claim to the respondent No.2 supported with all relevant documents that he has or references that he has and in turn the respondents shall scrutinize the said representation tallying it with the records available with the department and settle the dispute at the earliest preferably within a period of 90 days from today.
7. It is further directed that while the petitioner makes the representation, he shall also make available the copy of the LPC that he has and other relevant records, which would be necessary for the proper resolving of the dispute.
8. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge