

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 416 of 2019**

Rupoutin Bai Wd/o Ramhlu Prasad Madhukar Aged About 59 Years
R/o Reenwapar, Pamgarh, Block Pamgarh, District Janjgir Champa
Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Public Instructions, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Joint Director Treasury, Account And Pension, Pension, Bilaspur Division, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
4. District Education Officer Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh.
5. Block Education Officer Pamgarh, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh.

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. K.S. Pawar, Advocate along with Ms. Preeti Yadav, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****24/01/2019**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that, inspite of an order on an earlier occasion passed by this Court on 25.07.2017, in WPS No. 3310/2017, the respondents have till date not taken a decision on the claim of the petitioner, so far as grant of regular payscale from the date of initial appointment to her deceased husband, who died in harness on 22.05.2003.
2. The fact that the claim of the petitioner is a monetary claim and there was already an order by this Court, the present writ petition, in the opinion of this Court, can be disposed of with a direction to the

respondents No. 3 & 4 to take a decision, so far as the claim of the petitioner is concerned, at the earliest.

3. The reason, why this Court is entertaining the second round of litigation is that the husband of the petitioner died in the year 2003, it is almost more than 15 years now and the poor widow has till date not received, what the husband was otherwise legally entitled for, if at all.
4. Let the authorities scrutinize the case of the husband of the petitioner and pass a suitable order at the earliest, preferably within an outer limit of 4 months from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.
5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion, so far as the entitlement of the monetary benefits to the petitioner. The authorities, however, would decide the same in accordance with the rules and regulations governing the field.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved