

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 1555 of 2009

Balram Prasad Shukla S/o Shri Bhagwat Deen Shukla, aged about 50 years, presently posted as Assistant Teacher, Primary School Kooli, Development Block Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

---Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department of School Education, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.).
2. Director, Directorate of Public Instructions, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.).
3. District Education Officer, District Bilaspur (C.G.).
4. Block Education Officer, Tehsil Masturi, District Bilaspur (C.G.).
5. Joint Director, Treasuries Accounts and Pension, Bilaspur (C.G.).

---Respondents

For petitioner	:	Shri P.Acharya on behalf of Shri Amrito Das, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

07/08/2018

1. The present Writ Petition has been filed seeking for direction to the respondents for providing benefit of rehabilitation policy at the earliest and also for implementing the order dated 20/08/2007 passed by the State Government.
2. On perusal of record this Court feels that, the substantive relief which perhaps the petitioner seeks is for getting his service rendered with the Army i.e. a period of 2 years and 299 days to be counted for the purpose of counting his total length of service for quantifying his retiral dues, etc.

3. Perusal of record shows that, the petitioner is still in service and has got few more years left for retirement and the benefit which the petitioner is claiming would be those which he would be receiving at the time of his retirement. That the present Writ Petition seems to have been filed more on the apprehension of the petitioner.

4. Reserving the right of the petitioner for claiming appropriate relief at the time of his retirement if the respondents do not grant the same while quantifying his retiral dues, the present Writ Petition in its present form stands disposed off.

5. The disposal of the Writ Petition by itself would not preclude the petitioner from making a detailed representation specifically mentioning as to what exactly is the claim of the petitioner which according to him he is entitled from the State Government under the rehabilitation policy which has not been provided as on date or which he would had been entitled at the time of his retirement.

6. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE