

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 2884 of 2007

Smt. Pitar Bai W/o Lt. Anganu Ram Chauhan, Barpara, Kohdiya, District-Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Through Chairman, Board Headquarters Raipur (C.G.)
2. Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board Thr. Its Chairman, Rampur, District-Bastar,
3. Chief Engineer, Chhattisgarh Electricity Power House, District-Korba,
4. Union of India, Through : Secretary Department of Personal Public Grievance and Personal, Third floor Loknayak Bhawan Khan Market New Delhi

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Parag Kotecha, Counsel
For Respondents No. 1&3	:	Mr. A. S. Gaharwar, Counsel
For Respondent No. 4	:	Mr. Bhunpendra Singh, Counsel

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order On Board

24/08/2015

1. The dispute in the present Writ Petition is a claim of compassionate appointment on account of the death of husband of the Petitioner who died in harness on 15.12.1998.
2. The refusal on part of the respondent was on account of the fact that the Respondents No. 1 establishment was constituted subsequent to the formation of State of Chhattisgarh on 15.11.2000.
3. The counsel appearing for the parties submit that indisputably, a number of cases of similar nature have already been decided by this

Court. A couple of which are in WPS No. 52/2015 Rakesh Kumar Dubey Vs State of Chattisgarh & Ors. and also on WPS No. 360/2015 Raja Ram Kosle Vs. Chhattisgarh Power Distribution Company & Ors. wherein this Court vide Orders dated 28.01.2015 as well as 08.04.2015 respectively have decided identical matters with the direction to the Respondent to consider the application of the Petitioner in accordance with the policy dated 30.01.1997, prevalent at the time of death of the deceased.

4. In view of the foregoing, the present Writ Petition is also allowed and disposed of in terms of orders passed by this Court in two writ petitions referred above.
5. Needless to mention that while deciding the claim application the authorities shall strictly consider the claim in accordance to the policy as it stood on 30.01.1997 and this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the claim.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge