

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 9317 of 2019

Smt. Shashiprabha Soni, W/o. Jagannath Soni, Aged About 42 Years,
Presently Working As Lecturer (L.B.) At Govt. High School, Suretha, Block
Mungeli, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mantralaya, P.S. Rakhi, Tahsil Aarang, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Department Of Education, Mantralaya, P.S. Rakhi, Tahsil Aarang, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
4. District Education Officer, Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
6. Block Education Officer, Block Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri C.Jayant K. Rao, Advocate
For State	:	Smt. Deepti Shukla, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

15.11.2019

Heard.

1. The limited prayer which the petitioner has sought in this writ petition is for a direction to respondent no.1 to take a decision on the claim of the petitioner for grant of two advance increments on her obtaining B.Ed./D.Ed. certificate both prior to appointment as well as subsequent to the appointment which is being otherwise provided to the Govt. teachers.
2. The claim of the petitioner is based on the fact that the nature of duties discharged by her as Shiksha Karmi are identical and similar to the government teachers and her services have also now got merged with the

Education Department. Therefore, the benefits which are being extended to the government teachers should also be extended to the petitioner.

3. Given the nature of dispute and also the fact that the claim of the petitioner would require a policy decision on the part of the State Govt., this court does not intend to keep the petition pending any further, rather ends of justice would meet if the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents 1 & 2 to take a decision in this regard as to whether the petitioner would also be entitled for similar benefits as are being granted to the regular government teachers. It is ordered accordingly. Let this exercise be concluded within a period of 4 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioner to bring the order of this Court to the notice of respondents 1 & 2 along with any fresh representation, if she so prefer.
4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed anything on merits of the case so far as the entitlement of the petitioner are concerned. The Respondents shall be at liberty to take a decision independently.

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge