

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No.3715 of 2016**

1. Neelam Sahu D/o Shri B. R. Sahu, Aged About 26 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Under The Office Of Special Branch, Dhamtari, P. S. Dhamtari, District Dhamtari (Chhattisgarh)
2. Smt. Yukti Verma, W/o Late Shri Radheshyam Verma, Aged About 35 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Under The Office S. R. P. Raipur P. S. Ganj, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Pushpendra Kumar Pandey, S/o Late Shri B. L. Pandey, Aged About 30 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Under The Office Of Superintendent Of Police, Raipur, P. S. Civil Line, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

---- **Petitioners****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 & Pension, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioners	:	Shri Prakash Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Dhiraj Wankhede, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****12/08/2016**

Heard.

2. Learned counsel for petitioners would submit that the petitioner No.1 is directly recruited, whereas the petitioners No.2 & 3 have been recruited on compassionate basis on the post of Sub Inspector (M). The grievance of the petitioners is that despite order passed by this Court in W.P.(S)No.4563/2006 and the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Appeal No.426/2011, against which, SLP was

preferred, which was dismissed by the Supreme Court, the benefits made admissible to similarly placed persons vide order dated 03-12-2013 passed by the Home Department, has not been extended to the petitioners. According to learned counsel for the petitioners, Director General of Police has also issued communication dated 28-09-2013 for granting similar benefits to the similarly placed persons but necessary orders have not been passed in so far as petitioners are concerned.

3. Learned State counsel would submit that in the event, the petitioners submit fresh representation before the competent authority, their cases shall be scrutinized and if after due verification, it is found that their cases are similar, they shall be entitled to all such benefits available to them in accordance with law.

4. In view of above, this petition is finally disposed off with a direction that in the event, the petitioners submit 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 their cases and if upon verification, it is found that the petitioners are 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 petitioners, they would be at liberty to move afresh before this Court.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge