

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3999 of 2018

Sunil Kumar Samrit S/o H.B. Samrit, Aged About 58 Years Training Officer,
Industrial Training Institute, Mana, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District :
Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Skill Development, Technical Education And Employment Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director, Directorate, Employment And Training Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan, Block 4, First Floor, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Deputy Director (Establishment), Directorate, Employment And Training, Chhattisgarh, Indrawati Bhavan, Block-4, First Floor, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Principal, Government Industrial Training Institute, Mana Camp, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. R.K. Thakur S/o N.S. Thakur, Training Officer, Govt. Industrial Institute, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Uttam Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

22/07/2019

1. The limited grievance which the petitioner has made is for an appropriate direction to the respondents to consider the past services that the petitioner has rendered as a Junior Instructor since 1988 to be treated as qualifying service for promotion as well as for seniority.
2. The contention of the petitioner is that the respondent No.5, who is also identically placed like that of the petitioner and who is junior to the petitioner from the very beginning has been granted the benefit by the

State Government, but the petitioner has not been extended the same benefit.

3. Given the said facts and circumstances of the case, let the respondents No. 2 to 4 consider the claim of the petitioner so far as the past services rendered by the petitioner is concerned from 1988.
4. Let the petitioner bring to the notice of the respondents No.2 to 4 all the relevant records to establish that he has been initially appointed in the year 1988. The respondents No.2 to 4 in turn shall subject to verification of the entire records consider the claim of the petitioner in the light of the relief that has been extended to the respondent No.5-R.K. Thakur, the Training Officer under the respondents. Let a decision be taken in this regard within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.
5. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to apprise the respondents No.2 to 4, so far as the order passed by this Court is concerned.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved