

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 746 of 2021**

1. Onkar Singh Tamrakar S/o Late Kanwal Singh Tamrakar Aged About 53 Years Assistant Revenue Inspector At Municipal Corporation, Durg, R/o Kolihapara, Near Housing Board Colony, P.S. Pulgaon, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh ---- **Petitioner**
Versus
1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Town And Urban Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Director Urban Administration And Development Chhattisgarh, Directorate, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Municipal Corporation Durg, Through- Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Durg, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Collector District- Durg, Chhattisgarh. ---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Roop R. Naik, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Amit Buxy, P.L.
For Respondent No. 3	:	Mr. Shivraj Singh, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****19/02/2021**

1. The grievance in the present writ petition is that the petitioner's period of regular suspension between 08.10.2016 to 10.01.2017 has not been regularized, he has not been paid difference of wages and other benefits for the said period upon revocation of suspension order.
2. The facts of the case is that the petitioner working under the Respondent No. 3, was placed under suspension for the period between 08.10.2016 to 10.09.2017. The petitioner from 10.01.2017 was inflicted with a punishment of stoppage of one increment with

cumulative effect. Against the said order, the petitioner made his representation before the authorities concerned. Accepting representation, the respondent No. 3 has vide order Annexure P/5 dated 18.01.2019 has cancelled the punishment after giving a warning to the petitioner instead of stoppage of one increment with cumulative effect.

3. According to the petitioner, subsequent to the punishment order being cancelled by the authorities concerned, the respondents ought to have decided how the suspension period has to be treated and an appropriate order also for the difference of wages and other benefits should have been treated. The respondent-authorities have not done so in-spite of repeated representation being made.
4. Counsel appearing for the respondent No. 3 submits that since the petitioner's representation is pending consideration, the same shall be decided in accordance with law at the earliest.
5. Given the said submission, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent No. 3 to ensure that the representation which the petitioner has preferred in-respect-of his monetary claim for a period during suspension be decided in accordance with law at the earliest preferably within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge