



CGHC010002732017

Digitally signed
by NADIM
MOHLE

2026:CGHC:29334

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 2222 of 2017**

1 - Munnalal Chandrakar (Died) Through Lrs (As Per Honble Court Order Dated 17-06-2025).

1.1 - Smt. Eva Madhuri Lal W/o Late Munna Lal Chandrakar Aged About 57 Years R/o Secotor- 03, Shivanand Nagar, Khamtari, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Prabhat Prasad Kesharwani S/o Shri Nandkishore Besharwani, Aged About 55 Years Working On The Post Of Compounder, At Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Hospital, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, R/o New Colony, Kushalpur, Behind Ramabhawan, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Ramkishun Dhiwar S/o Late Shri Manbodhram Dhiwar, Aged About 57 Years Working On The Post Of Compounder, At Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Hospital, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, R/o Ayurvedi College, Campus, Nurses Quarter No.13 P W D District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

4 - Deo Ram Sahu S/o Late Shri Lakhanlal Sahu, Aged About 55 Years Working On The Post Of Compounder, At Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar Hospital, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, R/o Ayurvedi College, Campus, Nurses Quarter No.13 P W D District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Finance, Mantralay, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, Chhattisgarh

2 - State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Health And Family Welfare Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Juhi Anguriya, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Rajesh Kumar Kesharwani, Advocate

For Respondent(s)/State : Mr. Anil S. Pandey, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

13/07/2026

1. The petitioners have filed this petition seeking the following relief(s):-

"10. a. This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue a writ in the nature of mandamus or suitable direction to the respondent authorities for grant of arrears to the compounders in revised pay scale of Rs. 5200-20200/-+ grade pay Rs. 2400/- up to 31.12.2015.

b. This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quashed the part of the order impugned dated 04.03.2016 (Annexure P-1) issued by the respondent no. 1 whereby the arrears has been restricted.

C. Any other relief as the Hon'ble Court may be deemed fit and proper.

d. Cost of petition may kindly be allowed."

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would argue that the petitioners are retired employees, who were working on the post of Compounder for 30-31 years in the Health Department. She would further submit that after the formation of the State of Chhattisgarh, the designation of Compounder was changed to Pharmacist Grade-II. She would contend that the Dr. D. N. Tiwari Committee was constituted by the State Government, and recommended revision of pay scale & specific order was passed on 22.07.2011. She would further submit that though the petitioners got retired from service, but the benefit of the revised pay scale has not been extended to the petitioners, however, same benefits have been extended to other similarly situated

Government servants. It is also contended that vide order dated 04.03.2016, respondent No. 1 has restricted the arrears of the revised pay scale up to 31.12.2015, which is arbitrary and deserves to be quashed.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents would oppose the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners and submit that respondent No. 1, in clear terms, restricted benefits of the revised pay scale up to 31.12.2015. He would contend that the petitioners accepted the said circular without raising any objection and, after receipt of part of arrears of revised pay scale, they preferred this petition, therefore, the petition deserves to be dismissed.
4. Heard.
5. Having considered the submissions and the issue involved in the present case, the petitioners are granted liberty to make a representation before respondents No. 1 and 2 within a period of 45 days, and in turn, respondents No. 1 and 2 are directed to consider and decide the representation so made by the petitioners strictly in accordance with law, preferably within a further period of 120 days.
6. With the aforesaid observation(s) and direction(s), this writ petition is hereby **disposed of**.

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

JUDGE

Nadim