



2026:CGHC:3241



2026:CGHC:3241

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 592 of 2026

1 - Smt. Saroj Verma W/o Late Dr. Ramkumar Verma Aged About 82 Years
R/o B/289, Kranti Nagar, Behind Hanuman Temple, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur
C.G.

--- Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Higher Education Department,
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur
C.G.

2 - Commissioner, Higher Education, Indravati Bhawan, Nawa Raipur, Atal
Nagar, District Raipur C.G.

--- Respondent(s)

(The cause title is taken from CIS)

For Petitioner	: Ms. Savita Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondents/State	: Mr. Khulesh Sahu, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order On Board

20/01/2026

- At the outset learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the issue involved in this petition has already been decided by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 05.03.2019 passed in W.P. No.



407/2005 and other connected matters and that the reliefs claimed therein have already been granted to the similarly situated persons in those cases. In those matters even the Writ Appeal No. 111/2022 also met the fate of dismissal. Subsequently, other petitions also came to be disposed of issuing a direction for deciding the representation to be preferred by the petitioners in the light of aforesaid order passed by learned Single Judge, maintained by the Division Bench as well. She thus submits that purpose of this petition would be served if the same order which has been passed in WPS. No. 1663/2022 vide order dated 20.08.2024 is passed in this case as well.

2. On the other hand, learned State counsel does not object the proposition of the counsel for the petitioner. He however submits that against the order dated 25.08.2023 passed in WA No. 111/2022 and other connected appeals the State is in the process of challenging the same before the Supreme Court by filing Special Leave Petition and therefore he submits until and unless some order is passed by the Supreme Court, it cannot be said that the case of the petitioners is squarely covered with the order passed in the Writ Appeals arising out of the WP 407/2005 and other connected petitions.
3. Be that as it may, as the issue involved in these petitions has already been decided by the Division Bench of this Court and the reliefs claimed in the petition had already been granted to the similarly situated persons in those cases, and the appeal has also been dismissed. Therefore, in stead of keeping these petitions pending, this Court is of the opinion that ends of justice would be served if this petition is disposed of permitting the petitioner to make representation



along with copy of the orders passed in WA Nos. 111/2022 and in WP No. 407/2005 to respondents No. 1 and 2 within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order and the respondents No. 1 and 2 in turn are expected to decide the same within a further period of 120 days from the date on which such representation is presented before them. Needless to say, this order would be subjected to any order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Balram