

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 1770 of 2015**

- Durjan Sahu S/o Mannu Sahu (wrongly written gannu in Annexure P-1) Aged About 64 years, Residence of Delki, Post Lachhanpur, District Baloda-Bazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Chief Engineer, Mahanadi Pariyojna, Water Resources Department, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Water Management, Sub Division No.6, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
4. Joint Director, Treasury, Accounts and Pension, Raipur, chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri C.Jayant K. Rao, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, GA for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****08/05/2015**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was the employee of work charged and contingency paid establishment, having been earlier appointed as daily wager and thereafter attained the status of temporary employee, in accordance with the Chhattisgarh (Work-Charged and Contingency Paid Employees) Pension Rules, 1979 (for short 'the Rules, 1979'). The petitioner was regularized on 13-8-2008 and thereafter retired on 31.3.2013.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the petitioner's

past service, prior to the date of regularization, is not counted for the purposes of granting pension and as such, he has been declared ineligible for pension. Learned counsel would refer to the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court decided on 26-2-2015 in Writ Appeal No.281/13 and other connected matters, wherein this Court has held that in view of the State Government's instructions dated 2-3-2005, petitioners temporary service be taken into account to reckon pensionable service and the appellants of the said writ appeals were held entitled to pension under the Rules, 1979.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents would not dispute the legal decision as has been laid down by the Division Bench.
4. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that on fresh representation being filed by the petitioner within a period of four weeks, the respondents shall decide petitioner's entitlement to pension, in accordance with the law laid down by this Court in Writ Appeal No.281/13 within a further period of three months, subject to verification of facts or any other order passed by the Division Bench or the Supreme Court on the issue.

JUDGE

ashu