

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 3149 of 2015**

1. Badri Vishal Tiwari S/o Late Kushal Prasad Tiwari, Aged About 52 Years
Asstt. Revenue Inspector, Nagar Panchayat Bodri, Civil And Revenue
District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
2. Firtoo Ram Vishwakarma S/o D.R. Vishwakarma, Aged About 52 Years
Asstt. Revenue Inspector, Nagar, Panchayat Bodri, Civil And Revenue
District. Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Transport,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur
2. Secretary, Department of General Administration, Mahanadi Bhawan,
Mantralaya, New Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Secretary, Department of Urban Administration And Development, Mahandi
Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. Commissioner, Urban Administration And Development Department,
Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, Through Its Managing
Director, Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, Shastri
Chowk, Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. Nagar Panchayat Bodri, Through The Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar
Panchayat Bodri, Distt. Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Ravindra Agrawal, Advocate
For Respondents-State	:	Shri YS Thakur, Dy. AG for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****28/08/2015**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners were
working in the 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.

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 representation pending before the said authority. He is restricting their prayer in view of the order passed by this Court in the matters of **O.P. Singh Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others¹**, **Abdul Hakim Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others²**, **Uttam Kumar Sharma Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others³**, **Raju Pandey & others Vs. The State of Chhattisgarh & others⁴**, **Nandkumar Vaishnav & others Vs. The State of Chhattisgarh & others⁵** and **Chandrayan Singh Thakur & others Vs. The State of Chhattisgarh & others⁶**.
3. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that in the event, the petitioners submit fresh representation before the competent authority of the respondents within a period of four weeks, the said authority shall consider and decide petitioners' representation in an objective manner keeping in view the circular issued by the State Government from time to time, as also the orders of absorption passed with respect to the similarly

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

placed employees, as early as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of submission of representation.

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