

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 2040 of 2016**

Janak Lal Chandrakar S/o Late Shri Dauwaram Chandrakar, Aged About 64 Years R/o Block 93, Plot No. 2, Nehru Nagar ( East ), Bhilai, District Durg (Chhattisgarh).

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through : Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mahanadi Bhavan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, P. S. Rakhi, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. The Director, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mahanadi Bhavan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, P. S. Rakhi, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
3. Municipal Corporation, Bhilai, Through Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Bhilai, District Durg (Chhattisgarh).

**---- Respondents**

---

|                           |   |                                                                       |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner            | : | Shri Sudeep Agrawal, Advocate                                         |
| For State                 | : | Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy. Govt. Advocate                            |
| For Municipal Corporation | : | Shri H.B. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate with<br>Shri Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate |

---

**S.B.:Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**

**Order On Board**

**14/06/2016**

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's claim that regular services rendered by the petitioner as regular employee of erstwhile Special Area Development Authority (for short "SADA") Bhilai, where he was initially appointed are liable to be counted for the purposes of pensionable services. He submits that identical issue has been decided by this Court vide order dated 08.02.2016 in batch

of petitions WP(S) No.4459 of 2014 and other cases.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents do not dispute the petitioner's claim of being identically placed as the petitioner, in whose favour, orders were passed in the case referred to above.

3. In view of the above, this petition is also liable to be allowed and is allowed. Let the same benefit accrue to the petitioner as directed by this Court vide order dated 08.02.2016 in similar petition.

Sd/-  
**(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)**  
Judge