



2026:CGHC:12615



2026:CGHC:12615

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 2489 of 2026**

- Mahesh Singh Mandavi S/o Late Shri Harishankar Mandavi Aged About 61 Years Working As Veterinary Assistant Surgeon, Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner**versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Livestock Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Director Veterinary Services, Indrawati Bhawan, Block No. 3, Ground Floor, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Somkant Verma, Advocate
For Respondents-State	:	Mr. Aditya Tiwari, Panel Lawyer

SB: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge**ORDER ON BOARD****17/03/2026**

1. Petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent No. 1 to consider case of the petitioner for grant of time scale of pay as also granted to Medical Officer/ Dental Surgeon, within stipulated period.

10.2 That, this Hon’ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent no. 1 to consider case of the petitioner in the light of



order dated 07.01.2026 passed in Writ Petition No. 23100/2024, in matter of Dr. Vishnu Kumar Gupta and others vs. The State of M.P. within stipulated period.

10.3 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue any other writ/order/direction as deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is working as Assistant Veterinary Surgeon and he is eligible for the time pay scale. He contended that the State Government has issued a Circular, Annexure P-2 dated 01.04.2013 with respect to the doctors of the Health and Family Welfare Department for granting time pay scale after completion of 6 years of service, however, the said benefit was not extended to the petitioner and therefore petitioner may be permitted to submit fresh representation before Respondent No. 1 and direction be issued to the concerned authority to consider and take decision on the representation of petitioner at the earliest within specified time.
3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondents/State submits that as the petitioner is not pressing this writ petition on merits and only seeking permission to submit representation before the competent authority, he is having no objection to the limited prayer made by the counsel for petitioner.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record.
5. On due consideration of the submission of counsel for the respective parties, facts and circumstances of the case, nature of grievance raised by the petitioner, without entering into the merits of



the claim of petitioner, this writ petition at this stage is disposed of permitting the petitioner to submit representation before Respondent No. 1 and in the event petitioner submits such representation the concerned authority shall consider and take decision on the representation to be submitted by petitioner, in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably within a period of 03 months from the date of receipt of representation.

6. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this writ petition stands **disposed of.**

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)

Judge