

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 385 of 2019

Sunder Lal Dewangan S/o Late Janak Ram Dewangan Aged About 66 Years Retired From Post Of Deputy Director, Industries, District Industry Center, Manendragarh, District- Koriya, Chhattisgarh At Present R/o- Barchhapara, Dewangan Mohalla, Champa, District- Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Secretary, Department Of Commerce And Industries, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Additional Director, Department Of Commerce And Industries, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Director Department Of Treasury, Accounts And Pension, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Joint Director, Department Of Treasury, Accounts And Pension, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
5. District Treasury Officer Janjgir, District- Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vishnu Koshta, Advocate along with Mr. Shobhit Koshta, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

21/01/2019

1. The limited grievance, which the petitioner has sought from the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for grant of arrears of salary, as also revision of the pensionary benefits that the petitioner is entitled for.
2. The facts of the case is that the petitioner stood retired from service on the 31st of October, 2012 from the post of Deputy Director. The grievance of the petitioner was that the petitioner was denied of his benefit of Time Bond Payscale w.e.f. 01.04.2006 onwards. The said grievance of the petitioner stood redressed vide Annexure P/2 dated 07.03.2018, wherein the

respondents have accepted the contention of the petitioner and ordered that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of the Time Bond Payscale w.e.f. 01.04.2006 onwards.

3. The petitioner vide the said order was also recommended for the revised payscale. However, though the order was passed on 07.03.2018, but the respondents till date have not complied with the same or implemented the said order dated 07.03.2018. According to the petitioner, the reason for non-implementation of the same has been attributed to the non-obtaining of proper sanction from the Department of Treasury.
4. Given the limited grievance, that the petitioner has, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the writ petition pending, rather ends of justice would serve if the direction is given to the respondent No.1 as well as the respondent No.3, to take an appropriate decision, so far as the entitlement and claim of the petitioner is concerned in respect of the arrears of salary and the revised pensionary benefits.
5. It is expected that the respondents No.1 & 3 shall take a decision at the earliest preferably within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.
6. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to appraise the respondents No. 1 & 3, so far as the order passed by this Court is concerned.
7. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge