



2026:CGHC:14927

NAFR

HIGH COURT of CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1633 of 2021

Mrs. Nazma Khan W/o Late Shri Abdul Subhan Khan Aged About 58 Years
R/o House No. 55, Sector, Ward No. 45, Seepat Road, Vijyapuram Colony,
District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 24-03-
2025).
... Petitioner

versus

- 1** - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Nava Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 2** - Engineer In Chief Water Resources Department, Sector 19, Shivrath Bhawan, Atal Nagar Nava Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
- 3** - Chief Engineer Hasdeo Bango Project , Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
- 4** - Superintending Engineer Hasdeo Barrage, Water Resource Department , Rampur , District Korba , Chhattisgarh.
- 5** - Executive Engineer Hasdeo Barrage, Water Resource Department, Rampur, District Korba , Chhattisgarh.
- 6** - The Principal Secretary Finance Department , Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar , District Raipur , Chhattisgarh.
- 7** - Director Treasury, Accounts And Pension Department , Nava Raipur Atal Nagar District Raipur , Chhattisgarh.
... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Ms. Apoorva Pandey, Advocate, holding the brief of Mr. Harshmander Rastogi, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. R.C.S. Deo, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

01/04/2026

1. At the very outset, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that initially the petitioner was appointed to the post of Lower Division Clerk vide order dated 01.07.1971 under the office of the Superintendent Engineer, Irrigation Circle, Bilaspur. She would further submit that the petitioner was promoted to the post of Upper Division Clerk vide order dated 12.11.1980, but thereafter he has not been granted further promotion. He would submit that in lieu of promotion, petitioner was entitled to one higher pay scale as per circular dated 28.04.2008. She would contend that the representation made by the petitioner before the respondent authorities is still pending consideration; thus, she would pray that direction may be issued to the respondent authorities to decide it expeditiously.
2. On the other hand, counsel appearing for the State would oppose the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner.
3. Heard.
4. Taking into consideration the prayer made by counsel for the petitioner, the instant petition is disposed of with a direction to Respondent No. 5 to decide the pending representation dated 22.09.2017, preferably within a period of 120 days from today.
5. With the aforesaid observation(s) and direction(s), the instant petition stands **disposed of**.

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE