

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 6110 OF 2019**

Mrs. Ramita Taram, W/o Mr. Mohit Ram Taram, aged about 34 years, by occupation Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. H.S.S. Anandnagar, PV 53, Block Koyalibeda, District U.B. Kanker (CG)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. The State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, School Education Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
2. Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
3. Director, Panchayat And Rural Development Department Sanchanalaya, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
4. District Education Officer, Kanker (C.G.)
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, District U.B. Kanker (CG)

... Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Parag Kotecha, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Ashutosh Mishra, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****14/08/2019**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present petition is the non-acceptance of the past service rendered by her as Shiksha Karmi Grade-III for the purpose of absorption in the Education Department.
2. The case of the petitioner is that she was initially appointed as Shiksha Karmi Grade-III with the Municipal Corporation, Raipur. Thereafter, she got selected as Shiksha Karmi Grade-I under the Zila Panchayat, Kanker and since then she continues to discharge her duties on that post. Earlier the petitioner had filed WPS No. 760/2019 for counting his previous service for grant of revised pay scale. The said writ petition was disposed of on 6.2.2019 and in compliance of the directions given by this Court, the respondents passed an order granting the benefit of revised pay scale taking the previous service rendered as Shiksha Karmi Grade-III under Zila Panchayat, Kanker.
3. The grievance of the petitioner now is that, though the department has accepted the past services of the petitioner for the purpose of grant of revised pay scale but when the question of absorption came the past services of the petitioner

are not being considered for want of proper NOC from the previous place of service of the petitioner.

4. 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 petitioner that so far as the 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.

5. The State counsel opposing the petition submits that it is a case where the petitioner 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 petitioner is not entitled for the relief that he has sought for and it is also not a case where there is any particular order which is under challenge in this writ petition.

6. 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 have 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.

7. 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 petitioner for the purpose of revised pay scale.

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

9. The petitioner would also be at liberty to file a fresh representation, if she so wants.

10. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

/sharad/