

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 2117 of 2013

M.P.Pandey S/o Late Sukhdeo Prasad Pandey, aged about 61 years,
Retired Accountant, O/o Junior Engineer, CSPDCL, Sheorinarayan, R/o
village & P.O. Kera, P.S. Navagarh, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.).

---Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Co. Ltd. {CSPDCL} Through its
Managing Director, H.Q. - Daganiya, Raipur (C.G.).
2. The Chief Engineer, CSPDCL, Bilaspur Region, Bilaspur (C.G.).

---Respondents

For petitioner	:	Shri Rajesh Kumar Kesharwani, Advocate.
For respondents	:	Shri K.R.Nair, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

07/05/2018

1. The challenge in the present Writ Petition is to the order – Annexure-P/4 dated 12/11/2012 whereby the representation made by the petitioner has been rejected.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner in the year 2011 had sought the change of the option which he had exercised in the year 1994 in respect of the benefit of Higher Pay Scale that he had received in the year 1994 has been rejected by the respondents.
3. Perusal of record would show that, the petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition only after his retirement. All through his service career, the petitioner has not challenged the same.

4. Further what also is evident is that the petitioner willingly and with wide open eyes had opted for the grant of higher pay scale which was granted to him with effect from 1994 onwards and which he continuously received till his retirement or atleast till 2011 when he had first sought for the change of the option.

5. Given the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, it is evidently clear that the instant Writ Petition suffers from inordinate delay in opting for a change in option. No justified explanation or reasons has been given by the petitioner as to why he had not immediately sought for the change of option that he had exercised in the year 1994.

6. Thus, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the counsel for the petitioner calling for an interference with the impugned order.

7. The Writ Petition suffers from delay and laches and it deserve to be and accordingly stands dismissed.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE