

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.5612 OF 2018**

1. Sanad Kumar Bhuraya S/o Alenram Aged About 68 Years Retired Head Master, Doundilohara, Tahsil And District Balod, Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Ministry Of School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Dy. Director, Directorate Of Public Educational Department, Block C, First Floor, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. District Education Officer Balod, District Balod, Chhattisgarh, District : Balod, Chhattisgarh
4. Principal Govt. Higher Secondary School Kannewada, District Balod, Chhattisgarh, District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.5679 OF 2018**

Jangli Ram Gangber S/o Late Mahetarram Aged About 68 Years Retired Head Master, Middle School Arjuni, Gurur, Tahsil Gurur, District Balod Chhattisgarh.

...Petitioner(s)**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Ministry Of School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Dy. Director, Directorate Of Public Educational Department, Block C, First Floor, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. District Education Officer Balod, District Balod, Chhattisgarh.
4. Head Master, Govt. Middle School, Arjuni, Block Gurur, District Balod (CG).

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Shri RK Pali, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Shri Mazid Ali, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****30.08.2018**

1. These are the two Writ Petitions filed by the petitioners claiming for the salary between 01/02/2012 to 21/05/2012.
2. It is a case where after the petitioner had superannuated from service, the respondents had granted an extension of service to the petitioners

and the petitioners have discharged their duties for the period between 01/02/2012 to 30/04/2012.

3. The fact that the petitioners were granted an extension of time is not in dispute. The fact that the petitioners have discharged their duties during the said period is also not in dispute. If that be so, the petitioners are therefore entitled for wages for the period they have worked. Hence, subject to the verification of the respondents as to whether the petitioners infact have discharged their duties between 01/02/2012 to 30/04/2012, the respondents are directed to ensure releasing all the salary to the petitioners for the period that they have worked with the respondents since 01/02/2012.
4. Let this exercise be done within a period of 60 days from today.
5. Both the Writ Petitions accordingly stands allowed and disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy
Judge