

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 592 of 2020**

- Ritu Shukla W/o Vivek Shukla Aged About 40 Years R/o Lecturer (Nagriy Nikay) At Government M. D. V. Higher Secondary School, Baloda Bazar, District Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Joint Director, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Palika Parishad, Baloda Bazar, District - Baloda Bazar - Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
4. District Education Officer, Baloda Bazar - Bhatapara, District - Baloda Bazar - Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Shishir Dixit, Advocate
For Respondent/ State	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****27.01.2020**

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was appointed under the provisions of Chhattisgarh Panchayat Shiksha Karmi (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules of 2007 without there being any requirement of passing B.Ed / D.Ed exam. She was confirmed and granted regular pay scale also.
2. Challenge is laid to the action of the respondents based on circulars dated 10/06/2016 and 08/03/2017 which according to the petitioner, seeks to

withdraw the monetary benefits like regular pay scale, annual increment and revised pay scale on the ground of not obtaining B.Ed degree.

3. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the issue raised by the petitioner was considered in batch of petitions i.e. WPS No.4271/2017 (Jayant Kumar Patle vs. State of Chhattisgarh and ors.) and other cases by this Court vide order 03/11/2017. Therefore, the petitioner be also granted similar relief.
4. Learned State counsel would submit that the Court considered cases of teachers in different categories enumerated in para 6 of the said order. The petitioner being an appointee under the Rules of 2007 would require consideration in terms of the direction contained in para 46 of the said order.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is already getting regular pay scale and increments also and the consideration would be confined to grant of revised pay scale.
6. The petitioner's case for grant of revised pay scale will have to be considered in terms of the order passed by this Court in the case of Jayant Kumar Patle (supra), in so far as other claim for grant of revised pay scale is concerned.
7. With the aforesaid observations, this petition is finally disposed off.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge