

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 653 of 2018

Umesh Kumar Joshi S/o Shri Bahal Das Aged About 35 Years Working
As Teacher (Panchayat) And Posted At Government Middle School
Dhanikhunta Block Bodla District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh., District :
Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Department Of Panchayat
And Rural Development Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Naya Raipur
District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Executive Officer , Zila Panchayat Kabirdham District Kabirdham
Chhattisgarh., District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh
3. Block Education Officer , Block Bodla District Kabirdham Chhattisgarh.,
District : Kawardha (Kabirdham), Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For petitioner : Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate
For State : Mr. Majid Ali, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order on Board

18/01/2018

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners were appointed under the provisions of Chhattisgarh Panchayat Shiksha Karmi (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules of 2007 without there being any requirement of passing B.Ed / D.Ed exam. They were confirmed and granted regular pay scale also.
2. Challenge is laid to the action of the respondents based on circulars dated 10/06/2016 and 08/03/2017 which according to the petitioner, seeks to withdraw the monetary benefits like regular pay scale, annual increment and revised pay scale on the ground of not obtaining B.Ed degree.

According to learned counsel for the petitioners, the issue raised by the

petitioners was considered in batch of petitions i.e. WPS No.4271/2017 (Jayant Kumar Patle vs. State of Chhattisgarh and ors.) and other cases by this Court vide order 03/11/2017. Therefore, the petitioners be also granted similar relief.

3. Learned State counsel would submit that the Court considered cases of teachers in different categories enumerated in para 6 of the said order. The petitioners being an appointee under the Rules of 2007 would require consideration in terms of the direction contained in para 46 of the said order.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioners are already getting regular pay scale and increments also and the consideration would be confined to grant of revised pay scale.

5. The petitioner's case for grant of revised pay scale will have to be considered in terms of the order passed by this Court in the case of Jayant Kumar Patle (supra), in so far as other claim for grant of revised pay scale is concerned.

6. With the aforesaid observations, this petition is finally disposed off.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

Judge