

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPS No.2602 of 2016**

Mridula Sharma W/o Shri C. M. Sharma, Aged About 26 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector, At Present 1st B. N., C.A.F. Bhilai, P.S. Supela, District Durg, (Chhattisgarh)

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Home And Police Affairs And Finance, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Director General Of Police, Police Head Quarter, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Joint Director, Treasury, Account And Pension, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

**---- Respondents**

---

|                      |   |                                             |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | : | Shri Palash Tiwari, counsel for petitioner. |
| For Respondent/State | : | Shri Dhiraj Wankhede, GA                    |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**

**Order On Board**

**04/07/2016**

Heard on admission.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the father of the petitioner was working as Sub Inspector (M), who died in harness. The grievance of the petitioner is that despite order passed by this Court in WPS No.4563/2006 and the order passed by Division Bench in W.A.No.426/2011 against which, the Supreme Court has dismissed SLP (Civil) No.13274/2013, the benefits made admissible to the similarly placed persons vide order dated 03-12-2013 issued by the Home Department, has not been extended to the petitioner. He would submit that the Director General of Police has already issued a communication on 28-09-2013 for extending similar benefits to all the similarly placed persons, but yet necessary orders have not been passed.

3. Learned State counsel would submit that in the event, the petitioner submits fresh representation before the competent authority, her case shall be scrutinized and if after due verification, it is found that her case is similar, she shall be entitled to all such benefits available to her in accordance with law.

4. In view of above, this petition is finally disposed off with a direction that in the event, the petitioner submits fresh representation before the competent authority claiming similar treatment as has been extended to the previous set of petitioner in whose favour Annexure P-1 has been passed, within a period of one month from today, the competent authority shall scrutinize her case and if on verification, it is found that the petitioner is identically placed, necessary orders in this regard be passed in accordance with law within a further period of two months.

5. If any adverse order is passed against the petitioner, she would be at liberty to move afresh before this Court.

Sd/-

**(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)**

**Judge**