

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3349 of 2020

- Smt. Urmila Tamrakar W/o Shri Sanjog Kumar Tamrakar, Aged About 40 Years Working As Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. Boys Higher Secondary School, Gurur, Block Gurur, And District Durg Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Education Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Director, Public Instructions, Directorate Of Education, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Commissioner Cum Director, Directorate Of Panchayat, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Akansha Jain, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order

25.08.2020

1. Heard
2. The Grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the non- acceptance of the past service rendered by the petitioner as Shiksha Karmi Grade-I by the respondents for the purpose of absorption in the Education Department.
3. The details of initial appointment of the petitioner as also the subsequent appointment and the post against which she was

appointed on two occasions, are reflected in the chart as produced below:

Petitioner's name	Date of Initial Appointment	Date of Subsequent Appointment
Smt. Maya Deshmukh	29.09.2011 (Shiksha Karmi Grade-I)	04.01.2012 (Shiksha Karmi Grade-I)

4. For the purpose of grant of revised pay scale, the State Government has taken the past service of the petitioner rendered as Shiksha Karmi Grade-I and has granted the benefit of revised pay scale on completion of 8 years of service starting from the time when the petitioner was initially appointed as Shiksha Karmi Grade-I.
5. Grievance of the petitioner now is that, though the department has accepted the past service of the petitioner for the purpose of revised pay scale but for the purpose of counting the total length of service for absorption in the Education Department, the past service is not being considered.
6. This Court does not find any strong reason or ground on the part of the department for not accepting the past service of the petitioner for the purpose of absorption, particularly when the department has counted the past service for the purpose of grant of revised pay scale.
7. Given the aforesaid facts, let the case of the petitioner be scrutinized by the respondents and an appropriate order be passed as to why the past service of the petitioner cannot be counted for the purpose of absorption when the department itself has counted the said period for the purpose of revised pay scale.
8. Under these circumstances, the petitioner would be at liberty to file a representation with the respondent No. 5 along with relevant

documents within a period of three weeks which shall be decided within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

9. The petitioner would be at liberty to file a suitable document in support of her claim.
10. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge

Vishakha