
(2018) 09 CHH CK 0448

Chhattisgarh High Court

Case No: Writ Petition (S) No. 6425 Of 2018

Aditya Prakash Namdeo And Ors

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Chhattisgarh And Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Sept. 27, 2018

Hon'ble Judges: P. Sam Koshy, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Ajay Shrivastava, Sunita Jain

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

P. Sam Koshy, J

1. The limited prayer which the petitioners have sought in this writ petition is for a direction to respondent no.1 to take a decision on the claim of the petitioners for grant of two advance increments on their obtaining B.Ed./D.Ed. certificate both prior to appointment as well as subsequent to the appointment which is being otherwise provided to the Govt. teachers.
2. The claim of the petitioners is based on the fact that the nature of duties discharged by them as Shiksha Karmis are identical and similar to the government teachers and their services have also now got merged with the Education Department. Therefore, the benefits which are being extended to the government teachers should also be extended to the petitioners.
3. Given the nature of dispute and also the fact that the claim of the petitioners would require a policy decision on the part of the State Govt., this court does not intend to keep the petition pending any further, rather ends of justice would meet if the petition is disposed of with a direction to the

petitioners to make detailed representation within a period of two weeks from today so far as their claim is concerned supported with all relevant

documents and in turn, the respondent No.1 shall take a decision in this regard as to whether the petitioners would also be entitled for similar benefits

as are being granted to the regular government teachers. It is ordered accordingly.

Let this exercise be concluded within a period of 4 months from

the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. It shall be the responsibility of the petitioners to bring the order of this Court to the notice of

respondents 1 along with any fresh representation, if they so prefer.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed anything on merits of the case so far as the entitlement of the petitioners are concerned. The

Respondents shall be at liberty to take a decision independently.