

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 5649 of 2019

Smt. Rameshwari Sahu W/o Tekesh Kumar Sahu, Aged About 35 Years
Working As Lecturer (Nagriya Nikay) And Posted At Govt. Aa. Aa. Higher
Secondary School Birgaon, Block Dharsiwa, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School
Education Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur
Chhattisgarh
2. The Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration, Mahanadi Bhawan,
Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Director, Directorate Of Chhattisgarh Public Instruction, Indrawati Bhawan,
Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Birgaon, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. District Education Officer, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Anshuman Shrivastava, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order on Board

02/08/2019

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the instant case in the writ petition is non
acceptance of the past services rendered by the petitioner as Teacher
Panchayat by the respondents for the purpose of absorption in the
Education Department.
2. The case of the petitioner is that initially the petitioner was appointed in the
Panchayat Department as Shiksha Karmi Grade – II in the year 2011. After

serving there for some time the petitioner again appeared for a fresh recruitment process initiated by the Urban Administration Department and he got selected as Lecturer(Nagri Nikay). According to the petitioner, for the purpose of grant of revised pay scale on completion of 8 years of service, the department had counted her past services that she had rendered under Panchayat Department i.e. the appointment initially made in the year 2011 and subsequently made in the year 2012 and had granted the benefit to the petitioner.

3. Grievance of the petitioner now is that though the department has accepted the past services of the petitioner for the purpose of revised pay scale but for the purpose of the counting total length of service for absorption in the Education Department the past services is not being considered.
4. The reason which has been informed to the petitioner is that the petitioner has not obtained NOC from the Panchayat Department while applying for appointment in Nagri Nikay and another reason for not considering was that there is change in the department of the petitioner for the purpose of counting two services.
5. So far as the non obtaining of NOC is concerned, the said aspect already stands decided by this Court in the case of **Mukesh Patel Vs. State of Chhattisgarh in WPS No. 2530/2017** decided on 28/11/2017 and so far as the change of department is concerned that issue also stands decided by this Court in the case of **Shabnam Khatun Vs. State of Chhattisgarh in WPS No. 6147/2018** and other connected writ petitions decided on 27/10/2018.
6. Given the aforesaid facts and judgments decided by this Court no strong reasons have been made out by the department as to why the services rendered by the petitioner in the Panchayat Department would not be

acceptable for the purpose of counting his total length of service so far as the claim for absorption is concerned. Once when the department has already accepted the past services for the purpose of revised pay scale there does not seem to be any good reason for not applying the same analogy for determining the issue of absorption.

7. Given the said facts and circumstances of the case, let petitioner's case be scrutinized by the respondents 1 & 2 and an appropriate order be passed deciding as to why the past services of the petitioner cannot be counted for the purpose of absorption, when the department itself has counted the said period for the purpose of grant of revised pay scale.
8. Let appropriate order be passed by the respondents 1 & 2 within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order after thorough verification of the individual details of the petitioner. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to apprise respondents 1 & 2 so far as order passed by this Court is concerned. The petitioner would also be at liberty to file fresh representation if she so wants.
9. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge