

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 432 of 2019**

1. Tilak Das Vaishnav S/o Shri Mohan Das Vaishnav Aged About 30 Years R/o Village- Mohanpur, Police Station And Tahsil- Lailunga, District- Raigarh, Civil And Revenue District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
2. Rajesh Kumar Pradhan S/o Late Daulat Ram Pradhan Aged About 30 Years R/o Village- Jhagarpur, Police Station- And Tahsil- Lailunga, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat (D.R.D.A.) Raigarh, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector Raigarh, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
4. The Deputy Director Agriculture Cum Project Manager Wcdc, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. The Project Officer, Gahira (Kelonadi), Block- Lailunga, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. M. K. Sinha, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Mishra, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****22/01/2019**

1. The two reliefs sought for in the present writ petition are for a direction to the respondents firstly to consider the release of the unpaid salary of the petitioners from March, 2015 till the date the petitioners have worked. Second relief sought for is for a direction to the respondents to consider re-engagement of the petitioners for work till the project work is undergoing.

2. Perusal of the record would show that the petitioners have been not in employment for past about two years that is from 2017. No plausible explanation has been given by the petitioner for not approaching the Court on an earlier occasion promptly. Neither have they shown of having approached any other authority.
3. In view of the same this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition for the said relief. However, as far as the payment of salary is concerned, it does not need any discussion as the petitioners if they have worked with the respondents during the said period that is March, 2015 onwards, they are definitely entitled for the salary for the period they have worked.
4. The writ petition to the aforesaid extent is allowed and the concerned authority that is Respondent No. 5 is directed to ensure after due verification if the petitioners are found to have worked from March, 2015 onwards they should be given salary for the said period without any further delay at the earliest preferably within a period of 60 days. So far as the re-engagement part of the petitioner is concerned, they shall be at liberty to approach the authority by way of representation for redressal of their grievances.
5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge