

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 377 of 2019

Smt. Neelima Sahu W/o Shri Ramdular Sahu Aged About 31 Years
Working As Assistant Teacher (L. B.) And Posted At Govt. Primary School
Pahanda, Block Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.,
District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayat Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary Department Of School Education Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. District Education Officer Baloda Bazar District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh., District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Kasdol District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh., District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
5. Block Education Officer Block Kasdol District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh., District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Shri U.P.S. Sahu, Advocate.
For State	:	Ms. Astha Shukla, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

21/01/2019

1. The limited prayer which the petitioner has sought in this writ petition is for a direction to respondent no.1 to take a decision on the claim of the petitioners for grant of two advance increments on his obtaining B.Ed./D.Ed. certificate both prior to appointment as well as subsequent to the appointment which is being otherwise provided to the Govt. teachers.
2. The claim of the petitioner is based on the fact that the nature of duties discharged by him as Shiksha Karmis is identical and similar to the government teachers and his services has also now got merged with the

Education Department. Therefore, the benefits which are being extended to the government teachers should also be extended to the petitioner. The petitioner in this regard has made representations to the respondents which are collectively marked in the petition as Annexure P-4.

3. Given the nature of dispute and also the fact that the claim of the petitioner would require a policy decision on the part of the State Govt., this court does not intend to keep the petition pending any further, rather ends of justice would meet if the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents 1 & 2 to take a decision in this regard as to whether the petitioner would also be entitled for similar benefits as are being granted to the regular government teachers. It is ordered accordingly. Let this exercise be concluded within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to bring the order of this Court to the notice of respondents 1 & 2 along with any fresh representation, if they so prefer.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed anything on merits of the case so far as the entitlement of the petitioner is concerned. The Respondents shall be at liberty to take a decision independently.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE