

NAFR

HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 8093 of 2022**

- K. Prakash Naidu S/o Late Shri K. Ramlingam Aged About 67 Years R/o MIG-34, Laxmi Niwas Colony, Lodhipara, Sarkanda, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

-----Petitioner

VERSUS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Local Administration, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, C.G.
2. Municipal Commissioner, Korba Nagar Nigam, Korba, C.G.

-----Respondents

(cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner : Mr. Neeraj Pradhan, Advocate

For Respondents-State : Mr. Ravi Bhagat, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge**ORDER****30/11/2022**

1. The limited grievance raised in this writ petition is that the petitioner while working with Respondent No. 2 stood retire on 28.02.2017 but till date the arrears of 6th Pay Commission is not released to him.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner stood retire on 28.02.2017 while working as Assistant Office Superintendent in the office of Respondent No. 2. During period of his service, benefit of 6th Pay Commission was extended to employees under Respondent No. 2 also in the year 2012 but the arrears of 6th Pay Commission was not released in favour of petitioner. After retirement of petitioner, he submitted a representation before Respondent No. 2 making a prayer for release of different pensionary benefits including payment of arrears of 6th Pay Commission. Except the arrears of 6th Pay Commission other retiral dues have been released in favour of petitioner after submission of representation. Thereafter, petitioner again submitted a representation before Respondent No. 2 for payment of arrears of 6th Pay Commission which is pending

consideration till date and therefore at this stage grievance of petitioner would be redressed if a direction be issued to Respondent No. 2 to consider and decide the pending representation at the earliest within specified time.

3. Mr. Bhagat, learned State counsel would submit that the grievance as raised by learned counsel for petitioner is against Respondent No. 2.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.
5. Considering the submission of learned counsel for petitioner, I am of the view that, without entering into the merits of the case, this writ petition can be disposed of at motion stage itself without issuing notice to Respondent No. 2, directing the Respondent No. 2 to consider and decide the pending representation of petitioner expeditiously.
6. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of. Respondent No. 2 is directed to consider and decide the pending representation of petitioner dated 13.10.2022, in accordance with law, expeditiously preferably within a further period of **08 weeks** from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge