

1 3

BEFORE THE HON'BLE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL BENCH AT
RAIPUR

CO P(1) 3739/01
O. A. NO: /2001

Rajesh Kumar Nigam,
S/o : Shri Anandilal Nigam,
Aged About 34 years,
Working as Time Keeper (Sthal Sahayak)
Public Works Department, Raipur Division,
National Highway Sub Division. Raipur.

APPLICANT

Versus

1. State of M.P.
Through: Secretary,
Public Works Department,
Vallabh Bhavan,
Bhopal.
2. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through: Secretary,
Public Works Department,
D.K. Bhavan,
Raipur (C.G)
3. Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department
Raipur Division,
Near Akashwani,
Raipur (C.G)

No.	1686/01
Filed today	4.7.01
by Shri -	N. K. V. G. S. A. 10
For Registrar, M. P. State Adm. Tribunal, RAIPUR.	

RESPONDENTS.

APPLICATION U/S. 19 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL ACT., 1985



18/04/16

90

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3738 of 2005

- Sushil Kumar Tiwari

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State And Ors.

---- Respondent

And

WPS No. 3739 Of 2005

- Rajesh Kumar Nigam

---- Petitioner

Vs

- State And Ors.

---- Respondent

For Petitioners

Shri N. K. Vyas, Advocate

For Respondent/State


Shri Y. S. Thakur, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

08/04/2016

1. In these two writ petitions, the petitioners were appointed as Time Keeper in the Department of Public Works. They are claiming benefit of pay scale of Rs.950-1530/- and the corresponding pay scale in the subsequent pay revision instead of pay scale of Rs.825-1220/-, which is claimed to be wrongly granted to them.





91

2. It is contended that the petitioners are entitled to benefit of the judgment rendered by the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal in the matter of **Laxmi Narayan Upadhyay v. State of M.P. and another¹**.
3. Learned State counsel would submit that the petitioners' case is not similar to the case of **Laxmi Narayan Upadhyay** (supra) and some other writ petitions filed before this Court have been disposed of reserving liberty in favour of the petitioners to file representation, therefore, in the present case also, the petitioners may submit representation, which shall be dealt with in accordance with law.
4. In view of the above, both the writ petitions are disposed of reserving liberty in favour of the petitioners to move representation before the competent authority within a period of one month and thereafter the competent authority shall decide the representation within a further period of 3 months.

Sd/-

JUDGE

PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA

Nirala