



CGHC010464782025

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 12489 of 2025

SANDEEP LAKRA versus UNION OF INDIA

WPS/5349/2026,WPS/5346/2026,WPS/2428/2026,
WPS/5038/2026,WPS/5035/2026,WPS/5023/2026,WPS/13637/2025,
WPS/13625/2025,WPS/13620/2025,WPS/13611/2025,WPS/13457/2025,
WPS/13374/2025,WPS/13371/2025,WPS/13358/2025,
WPS/13354/2025,WPS/13353/2025,WPS/13352/2025,WPS/13351/2025,
WPS/13350/2025,WPS/13348/2025,WPS/13347/2025,
WPS/13344/2025,WPS/13343/2025,WPS/13342/2025,WPS/13341/2025,
WPS/13340/2025,WPS/13337/2025,WPS/13335/2025,
WPS/13317/2025,WPS/13314/2025,WPS/13310/2025,WPS/13303/2025,
WPS/13302/2025,WPS/13300/2025,WPS/13293/2025,
WPS/13292/2025,WPS/13291/2025,WPS/13290/2025,WPS/13287/2025,
WPS/13284/2025,WPS/13283/2025,WPS/13282/2025,
WPS/13279/2025,WPS/13273/2025,WPS/13271/2025,WPS/13268/2025,
WPS/13101/2025,WPS/13087/2025,WPS/13082/2025,
WPS/13077/2025,WPS/13046/2025,WPS/13038/2025,WPS/13033/2025,
WPS/13014/2025,WPS/13012/2025,WPS/13009/2025,
WPS/13007/2025,WPS/13004/2025,WPS/13003/2025,WPS/13000/2025,
WPS/12998/2025,WPS/12997/2025,WPS/12995/2025,
WPS/12992/2025,WPS/12989/2025,WPS/12988/2025,WPS/12984/2025,
WPS/12983/2025,WPS/12981/2025,WPS/12980/2025,
WPS/12979/2025,WPS/12978/2025,WPS/12977/2025,WPS/12975/2025,
WPS/12974/2025,WPS/12973/2025,WPS/12971/2025,
WPS/12970/2025,WPS/12968/2025,WPS/12965/2025,WPS/12964/2025,
WPS/12960/2025,WPS/12958/2025,WPS/12956/2025,
WPS/12871/2025,WPS/12858/2025,WPS/12855/2025,WPS/12852/2025,
WPS/12851/2025,WPS/12850/2025,WPS/12848/2025,
WPS/12843/2025,WPS/12842/2025,WPS/12841/2025,WPS/12831/2025,
WPS/12830/2025,WPS/12804/2025,WPS/12793/2025,
WPS/12768/2025,WPS/12764/2025,WPS/12763/2025,WPS/12754/2025,
WPS/12749/2025,WPS/12746/2025,WPS/12744/2025,
WPS/12743/2025,WPS/12740/2025,WPS/12739/2025,WPS/12738/2025,

WPS/12730/2025,WPS/12728/2025,WPS/12721/2025,
WPS/12720/2025,WPS/12717/2025,WPS/12714/2025,WPS/12712/2025,
WPS/12711/2025,WPS/12708/2025,WPS/12706/2025,
WPS/12703/2025,WPS/12701/2025,WPS/12699/2025,WPS/12698/2025,
WPS/12685/2025,WPS/12665/2025,WPS/12621/2025,
WPS/12612/2025,WPS/12596/2025

Order Sheet

24.07.2026	Ms. Deepali Pandey with Mr. Sukhi Ram Sahu and Mr. Anubhav Vatsa, counsel for the respective petitioners. Ms. Anmol Sharma, Ms. Annapurna Tiwari, Ms. Pragya Pandey, Ms. Mandwi Bhardwaj, Mr. Sagar Soni, Mr. Ravikar Patel and Mr. Vidya Bhushan Soni, Central Government Counsel for respective respondents/Union of India. Mr. Sanjeev Pandey, Dy. Advocate General, Mr. Kalpesh Ruparel and Mr. Khulesh Sahu, Panel Lawyers for the State. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working on the post of BTMs and ATMs under the Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare Government of India known as ATMA Scheme, 2018 and the petitioners are claiming 10% increase in the prescribed salary as per the guidelines issued by the Government of India but from perusal of the petitions it does not reflect whether the petitioners are having requisite qualification for appointment on the said post as per the guidelines issued by the Central Government to claim parity. Let this factual matrix be clarified by learned counsel for the petitioners that what is essential qualification for

appointment and whether the petitioners are having requisite qualification for consideration or not.

The Scheme further provides that 60% fund has to be sponsored by the Central Government and 40% has to be sponsored by the State. The State is directed to clarify by way of an affidavit of Senior Officer as to how fund is utilized for the project whether financial assistance provided by the Center is only for the payment of salary or for research and development works also.

List this case on **17th August, 2026.**

**Sd/-
(Narendra Kumar Vyas)
Judge**

Bhumika