

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 6585 of 2019**

Sharad Yadav S/o Late Mr. Ramnath Yadav Aged About 44 Years
Occupation Teacher (Panchayat) P.T.I. Govt. H. S. S. Amoda, Block
Narharpur, District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**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, Sanchanalaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. District Education Officer Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat District Uttar Bastar Kanker Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Shalvik Tiwari, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Abhyunnati Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****02.09.2019**

1. Ignoring the default pointed out by the registry, with the consent of the parties the matter is heard finally and disposed off at the motion stage itself.
2. The grievance of the petitioner in this petition is non acceptance of the past service rendered by the petitioner in the past for the

purpose of absorption in the Education Department.

3. The case of the petitioner is that, the petitioner has been working under the respondents on different posts and has subsequently been given fresh appointment on different posts and since then continues to discharge his duty on that post. Earlier the petitioner had filed separate writ petition for counting his previous service for grant of revised pay scale. The said writ petition was disposed of and in compliance of the directions given by this Court, the respondents have passed an order on 10.01.2018 granting the benefit of revised pay scale taking the previous service rendered by them.
4. 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 is not being considered for want of proper NOC from the previous place of service of the petitioner.
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 petitioner 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 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 petitioner would have obtained an NOC from the department for appearing/selection in the subsequent recruitment process. State Counsel 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 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 petitioner for the purpose of revised pay scale.
9. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to apprise the respondent

No.1 so far as the order passed by this court is concerned.

10. The petitioner 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**

Jyotijha