

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 1084 of 2021**

Ramkripal Sankh S/o Hiraram Sankh, Aged About 76 Years, Posted As
Ex Lower Division Clerk At- Nagar Panchayat, Arang, District Raipur
Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mantralaya, Nawa Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Director, Urban Administration And Development, Chhattisgarh, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Joint Director, Urban Administration And Development, Raipur Division Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Collector, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. The Deputy Director, Urban Administration And Development, Raipur Division Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. The Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Arang, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. R. K. Kesharwani, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Wasim Miyan, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****12.03.2021**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the alleged non-payment of salary during the suspension period between 1982 to 1987.
2. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion that the petition suffers from inordinate delay and laches.

3. The claim of the petitioner is of the period 1982 to 1987. The petitioner continued his service up till 2003 when he stood retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation. All along from 1982-1987 till 2003 the petitioner never raised the dispute during his service period. That even after his retirement from service in the year 2003 the present writ petition has now been filed in 2021 i.e. after a period of almost 17 years from the date of his retirement. Even the documents which the petitioner relies upon i.e. Annexures P-6 & P-7 said to be the last correspondence made in respect of the petitioner is also of the year 2012 and thereafter also the present writ petition has been filed after more than 8 years.
4. Given all the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petition stands rejected on the ground of delay and laches alone.
5. However, the reluctance of this Court in entertaining the writ petition would not preclude the petitioner from approaching the respondents on the administrative side for ventilating his grievance.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**