

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPS No. 2525 of 2015**

1. Ramawatar Gupta S/o Late Ram Jiyawan Aged 60 years Working As Asst. Grade III, Nagar, Panchayat Sakri Tahsil Takhatpur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
2. Saheb Lal Yadav S/o Shri Bechan Lal Yadav Aged 53 Years Working As Asst. Revenue Inspector, Nagar Panchayat Sakri Tahsil Takhatpur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

**---- Petitioners****Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary Urban Administration & Development Department Mantralaya, Mahandi Bhawan, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Secretary General Administration Department Mantralay Mahandi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Secretary Transport Department Mantralay, Mahandi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. The Director Directorate Urban Administration And Development Department, Directorate, Indravati Bhawan, Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation Through Its Managing Director, C.I.D.C. Shastri Chowk, Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. The Chief Municipal Officer Nagar Panchayat Sakri District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondents**


---

|                       |   |                                             |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioners       | : | Shri Vinod Deshumukh, Advocate              |
| For Respondents/State | : | Shri Sangharsh Pandey, Dy. GA for the State |
| For Respondent No.5   | : | Shri RN Pusty, Advocate                     |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra****Order On Board****16/07/2015**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners were working in erstwhile M.P.S.R.T.C., however after creation of the State of

Chhattisgarh a separate Road Transport Corporation has not been constituted in the State of Chhattisgarh, therefore, their services were placed in the control of respondent/Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation (for short 'C.I.D.C.'). He would further submit that the State Government has issued number of circulars deciding to absorb services of the employees working in the erstwhile M.P.S.R.T.C in various Corporation/Mandals in the State of Chhattisgarh and in furtherance of the said policy several employees have already been absorbed and the case of the petitioners was also recommended, however the decision has not yet been taken and the petitioners are losing seniority, pay scale etc.

2. Learned counsel would further submit that for the present, the petitioners would confine their prayer for issuance of direction to the respondents to take a decision on the representations pending before the said authority. He is restricting his prayer in view of the order passed by this Court in the matters of **O.P. Singh Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others<sup>1</sup>**, **Abdul Hakim Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others<sup>2</sup>**, **Uttam Kumar Sharma Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others<sup>3</sup>**, **Raju Pandey & others Vs. The State of Chhattisgarh & others<sup>4</sup>**, **Nandkumar Vaishnav & others Vs. The State of Chhattisgarh & others<sup>5</sup>** and **Chandrayan Singh Thakur & others Vs. The State of Chhattisgarh & others<sup>6</sup>**.
3. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that in the event petitioners submit fresh representations before the concerned respondent within a period of four weeks, the said authority shall consider and decide petitioners' representations in an objective manner keeping in

---

1 WP (S) No.5521/2010  
 2 WP (S) No.473/2013  
 3 WP (S) No.476/2013  
 4 WP (S) No.1220/2013  
 5 WP (S) No.1458/2013  
 6 WP (S) No.2128/2013

view the circular issued by the State Government from time to time, as also the orders of absorption passed with respect to the similarly placed employees, as early as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of submission of representations.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the matter, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order, as opinion on the merits of the case.
5. With the above observation, the writ petition is finally disposed of.

Sd/-

JUDGE

Prashant Kumar Mishra

ashu