

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 1484 of 2020**

1. Umesh Kumar Sahu S/o Anand Sahu Aged About 37 Years Working As Lecturer (L.B.), Govt. Higher Secondary School Baya, Block Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
2. Kamlesh Kumar Verma S/o Sant Ram Verma Aged About 42 Years Working As Lecturer (L.B.), at Govt. Higher Secondary School Arjuni, Block Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
3. Nirmal Kumar Nag S/o Natwar Lal Nag Aged About 37 Years Working As Lecturer (L.B.), Govt. Higher Secondary School Chandan, Block Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
4. Smt. Chudamani Kujur D/o Mansita Ram Bhagat Aged About 42 Years Working As Lecturer (L.B.), at Govt. Higher Secondary School Baya, Block Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh,
3. Director Directorate Of Public Instruction, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Commissioner-Cum-Director Directorate Of Panchayat, Atal Nagar, New Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh,
5. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh,
6. District Education Officer, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh
7. Block Education Officer Kasdol District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Govind Dewangan, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Avinash Singh, PL.

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

04/03/2020

Heard.

1. The limited grievance which the petitioners have raised in this writ petition is that by virtue of order passed in WPS No.2530 of 2017 (Mukesh Kumar Patel and another Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and another) decided on 26.11.2017 the petitioners have been granted the benefit of revised pay scale on completion of 8 years of service.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the grievance which now remains is that the benefit is being provided to the petitioners prospectively and though the respondents have made a calculation which the petitioners were entitled from the date of their completion of 8 years but no effective orders have been passed nor has department taken any steps for release of the arrears of payment. The petitioners pray for appropriate direction to the respondents for releasing the said amount.
3. Without entering into the merits of the case and taking into consideration the judgment of this Court in the case of Mukesh Patel (supra) which has also been affirmed by the Division Bench and taking note of the fact that the respondents have complied with the order to the extent of granting revised pay scale to the petitioner, let respondents no. 2 to 5 take an appropriate decision at the earliest so far as release of the arrears of payment which the petitioners are entitled for. Expecting a decision from the respondents within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge