

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1113 of 2019

Digeshwar Gopanti S/o Late Shivnandan Lal Jaiswal Aged About 54 Years Presently Posted As Upper Division (Teacher), At Government Middle School, Tanakhar, Block- Pondi- Uroda, Korba, Chhattisgarh. R/o Purani Basti, Ward No.11, Katghora, District- Korba, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, School Education Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director Through Directorate Of Public Instruction, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. District Education Officer, Through Korba, District- Korba, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

20/02/2019

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that the juniors to the petitioner have been granted promotion to the post of Upper Division Teacher in the year 2011 and they have further been promoted to the post of Lecturer again in the year 2017, whereas the petitioner inspite of being senior to his juniors could get promotion as an Upper Division Teacher only in the year 2017 and in the process, the petitioner has been denied his claim for next promotion to the post of Lecturer.
2. According to the petitioner, there were some discrepancies in respect of the promotion, which were granted to his juniors in the year 2011 and the respondents subsequently on the petitioner's

making a representation verified and rectified the same and granted the promotion to the petitioner in the year 2017.

3. The only grievance that the petitioner has is that when the Department has rectified the issue of seniority and now granted promotion to the petitioner along with his juniors, they should have also granted the petitioner the benefit of promotion also from the date his immediate juniors were promoted i.e. in the year 2011. He further submits that down the line the said juniors have further been promoted to the post of Lecturer.
4. Perusal of the writ petition and the record enclosed along with that would show the petitioner does not seem to have made any representation in this regard to the higher authorities ventilating his grievances, but has straight away approached the High Court for appropriate order.
5. Given the said facts, let the petitioner file a detailed representation to the respondents No.2 & 3 within a period of 3 weeks from today along with all relevant records that are in his possession in respect of his claim. The respondents No.2 & 3 in turn on due verification of the records, shall pass a suitable order taking into consideration the contents of the representation and the documents enclosed therein within a further period of 4 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion so far as the entitlement of the petitioner is concerned.

7. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to appraise the respondents No.2 & 3 in respect of the order passed by this Court is concerned.
8. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved