

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 989 of 2021**

Komal Prasad Sharma S/o Late Shri Lalta Prasad Sharma, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Quarter No. 08, Pushp Pallav Colony, Jamnipali, Korba, Police Station Darri, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Forest Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralay, Police Station And Post Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Conservator Of Forest, Office Of Chief Conservator Of Forest, Sindhi Colony, Jarhabhata, Bilaspur Region, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
3. Divisional Forest Officer (DFO), Office Of Divisional Forest Officer, Korba Forest Division, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
4. Divisional Forest Officer (DFO), Office Of Divisional Forest Officer, Katghora Forest Division, District Korba, Chhattisgarh
5. Joint Director, Officer Of Joint Director, Treasury, Accounts And Pension Nehru Chowk, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

---

|                |   |                                       |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Mr. Abhishek Pandey, Advocate         |
| For State      | : | Ms. Akanksha Jain, Dy. Govt. Advocate |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order On Board**

**15.02.2021**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the non-settlement of the retiral dues of the petitioner.

2. According to the petitioner, he was working under the respondents as Dy. Forest Ranger and retired from service on 31.07.2020. According to the petitioner, after his retirement, he is being paid only 90% of the pension and that 10% of the pension has been retained by the authorities and other than the pension, he has not been released any other retiral dues like gratuity, leave encashment, benefit of the arrears of pay etc.
3. From the pleadings it appears that just before retirement, on 30.07.2020, the petitioner was issued with a charge sheet and a departmental inquiry was ordered against the petitioner but till date there is no further development in the case. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already approached the authority concerned seeking for releasing of the retiral dues in accordance with law.
4. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the writ petition at this juncture can be disposed of directing the respondents 2 to 5 to consider the claim of the petitioner as regards the releasing of the admissible retiral dues which the petitioner would be entitled for even if there is a charge sheet issued against him, within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
5. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

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