

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3794 of 2015

- Bhuneshwar Verma S/o Jhule Ram, Aged About 62 Years R/o Village Kharra, Post Kusmi, P. S. Kusmi, Tahsil, Civil & Revenue District Bemetara (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Chief Secretary, Public Works Department, Mantralaya, Rakhi, New Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Engineer-In-Chief, Public Works Department, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Near Raj Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Superintending Engineer, Public Works Department, Raipur Division, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Executive Engineer, Public Works Department, Tahsil And Division Bemetara, District Bemetara (Chhattisgarh)
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Public Works Department, Sub Division Bemetara, District Bemetara (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	Shri Rakesh Anthony, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Shri P.K. Bhaduri, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board By

16/10/2015

1. With the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, the matter is heard finally.
2. 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 26.08.2008 and thereafter retired on 31.03.2015.

3. 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, petitioner's 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.
4. Learned State counsel would not dispute the decision rendered by the Division Bench, however, he would submit that the State Government has preferred Review Petition No.61/2015 before the Division Bench in which, notices have been issued to the other side. He would submit that based on the outcome of the review petition, the matter shall be considered by the competent authority.
5. 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 4 weeks, the respondents shall decide the petitioner's entitlement to pension, depending upon and after the outcome of Review Petition No.61/2015.

Sd/-

JUDGE

PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA