

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 1960 of 2018

Churamani Patel S/o S/o Shri Moher Say Patel, Aged About 39 Years Presently Working As Lecturer Panchayat At Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School, Jhal, Block Baramkela, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Commissioner Cum Director, Directorate Of Panchayat, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Shri CJK Rao, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

01/03/2018

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was 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. He was 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 petitioner, 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 petitioner 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 petitioner 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 petitioner is 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