

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 6015 of 2019**

1. Mrs. Huma Pisda, W/o Mr. Punit Pisda, Aged About 30 Years, Occupation: Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. H.S.S. Korar Block Bhanupratappur, District - Uttar Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh
2. Mrs. Yamini Markam, W/o Mr. Sandip Sen Aged About 29 Years Occupation Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. Girls H.S.S. Korar, Block Bhanupratappur, District- U.B. Kanker, Chhattisgarh
3. Mrs Ilin Rose Kujur, W/o Mr. Firoj Kujur Aged About 42 Years Occupation Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. Girls H.S.S. Sambalpur, Block Bhanupratappur, District- U.B. Kanker, Chhattisgarh
4. Naresh Kumar Sonker, S/o Mr. Ratan Sonkar Aged About 35 Years Occupation Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Middle School, Chikhali Block Durgukondal, District- U.B. Kanker, Chhattisgarh
5. Shaturghan Sahu, S/o Mr. Pardeshi Ram Aged About 36 Years Occupationteacher (Panchayat), Govt. Middle School Kodapakha, Block Durgukondal, District- U.B. Kanker, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, School Education Department, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur, District - Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Director, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Sanchanarya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. District Education Officer, Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat District - Uttar Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Parag Kotecha, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Ms. Abhyunnati Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

13.08.2019

1. Ignoring the default pointed out by the Registry as of now, with the consent of the parties, the matter is heard finally at motion stage and disposed off.
2. The grievance of the petitioners in this Writ Petition is non acceptance of the past service rendered by the petitioners in the past for the purpose of absorption in the Education Department.
3. The case of the petitioners are that, the petitioners have been working under the respondents on different posts and have subsequently been given fresh appointment on different posts and since then continues to discharge their duties on that post. Earlier the petitioners had filed separate writ petitions for counting their previous service for grant of revised pay scale. The said writ petitions were disposed off and in compliance of the directions given by this Court, the respondents have passed an order on 29.05.2019, 13.02.2019 and 01.03.2019 respectively granting the benefit of revised pay scale taking the previous service rendered by them.
4. The grievance of the petitioners now is that, though the department has accepted the past services of the petitioners for the purpose of grant of revised pay scale, but when the question of absorption came, the past services of the petitioners is not being considered for want of proper NOC from the previous place of service of the petitioners.

5. The contention of the petitioner is that, once when the department has considered the past service for the purpose of revised pay scale, there is no reason why past services could not be counted for the purpose of absorption. It was further the contention of the petitioners that so far as requirement of NOC for the purpose of revised pay scale is concerned, the same stood already quashed by this court in WPS No. 2530 of 2017, Mukesh Kumar Patel Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others and other connected writ petitions, decided by this court on 28.11.2017.
6. The State counsel opposing the petition submits that, it is a case where the petitioners came into present service by way of participating as a fresh candidate in a fresh recruitment conducted, and therefore, the past services rendered cannot be counted unless the petitioners would have obtained an NOC from the department for appearing/selection in the subsequent recruitment process. He further submits that even the record does not show of the respondents taking a decision that the petitioners are not entitled for the relief that they have sought for and it is also not a case where there is any particular order which is under challenge in this writ petition.
7. Given the aforesaid contentions put forth on either side and on perusal of records, what is an admitted factual position is that the petitioner's past services has been counted by the department for the purpose of grant of revised pay scale. Once when the department accepts the past services for the purpose of revised pay scale, this court does not find any strong reason why the said period would not be counted for the purpose of absorption as the department itself has accepted the said period as continuous service for the purpose of granting revised pay scale.
8. Under the circumstances, let the Respondent No. 1 take a fresh decision on the issue and pass an appropriate order at the earliest preferably within

a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order keeping in view the fact that the department itself has counted the past services of the petitioners for the purpose of revised pay scale.

9. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioners to apprise the respondent No.1 so far as the order passed by this court is concerned.

10. The petitioners would also be at liberty to file a fresh representation, if they so want.

11. The Writ Petition, accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge