
(2019) 03 CHH CK 0016
In the Chhattisgarh High Court
Case No : Writ Appeal No. 42 Of 2019

Panch Ram Patel	Vs	APPELLANT
State Of Chhattisgarh And Ors		RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 01-03-2019

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2019) 03 CHH CK 0016

Hon'ble Judges : Ajay Kumar Tripathi, CJ; Vimla Singh Kapoor, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Yogesh Chandra, Siddharth Dubey

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Ajay Kumar Tripathi, CJ

1. Heard counsel for the parties.
2. Writ application was filed by the Appellant after his superannuation in the year 2018 making a grievance that he should have been granted Kramonnati on the date he completed 24 years of service i.e. 29.03.2000 instead of 01.08.2003.
3. Learned Single Judge took note of the fact that such benefit remained so for nine years and at no point of time, there was any objection raised on his behalf while he was in service. Only after more than a year of retirement, he is trying to claim a benefit of shifting the date. Writ application was dismissed on the ground of laches and delay.
4. Submission of the counsel for the Appellant is that in the case of S.B. Tripathi and Others v. State of Chhattisgarh reported in 2010 LawSuit (Chh) 4, a Division Bench took the view that it is a recurring cause of action as wrong fixation of salary and pay will create issues every month.
5. The complete facts and details are not available before us in the pleadings. It may be that on completion of 24 years, an employee becomes entitled to be

granted benefit of time-bound promotion (Kramonnati), but then this grant is always subject to fulfilling of all other requirements which includes the fulfillment of eligibility and conditions which are applicable for regular promotion. There could be reasons thereof why the Appellant chose to be silent all along while in service and never raised issue that there was a delay in grant of benefit of Kramonnati.

6. The circumstances being such, the view taken by the learned Single Judge that delay and laches does not enthruse him from entertaining the writ application cannot be said to be a wrong view so taken.

7. Appeal has no merit. It is dismissed.