

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 2444 of 2019**

1. Narendra Kumar Baghel S/o Shri Shiv Lal Baghel, Aged About 63 Years Retired Teacher, Government, Higher Secondary School Gundardehi District Balod Chhattisgarh.
2. Uday Ram Thakur, S/o Shri P.R. Thakur Aged About 63 Years Retired Teacher, R/o Village And Post Mokha, Tahsil Gurur, District Balod Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioners**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, School Education Department Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director, Public Instructions Chhattisgarh, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. District Education Officer, Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh.
4. District Education Officer, Durg District Durg Chhattisgarh.
5. Treasury Officer, Treasury, Account And Pension, Balod District Balod Chhattisgarh.

**---Respondents**

---

|                 |   |                             |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|
| For Petitioners | : | Mr. Somkant Verma, Advocate |
| For State       | : | Ms. Sunita Jain, G.A.       |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**04/04/2019**

1. The present is a second round of litigation, so far as the petitioner No.1 is concerned and first round of litigation for petitioner No.2.
2. The petitioner No.1 on an earlier occasion had filed a writ petition i.e. WPS No. 7462/2011, which got disposed of on 09.12.2011, whereby this Court had directed the respondents to decide the representation, which the petitioner had made keeping in view the judgment passed by the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal in ***O.A. No.2745/1989 (Madhukant Yadu and 56 others Vs. State of M.P. & others)***.

3. The contention of the petitioners is that though they have made repeated representations, but till date those representations have not been decided, though considerable time has lapsed. Meanwhile, according to the petitioners similar benefits have been extended to similarly placed persons, in the Department, where the petitioners are working, as also in the neighboring districts.
4. Given the said facts, particularly taking note of the fact that the representations of the petitioners have till date not been decided, let the petitioners make a fresh representation to the respondent No.1 in this regard supported with all relevant records, orders and circulars, so also the orders pertaining to similarly placed persons, the respondent No.1 is directed to decide the same at the earliest preferably within a period of 4 months after due verification of the entitlement of the petitioners as compared to similarly placed persons.
5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion so far as the entitlement of the petitioners is concerned. The authorities would be free to take a decision purely 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