

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 5323 of 2016

1. Aakash Navik S/o Late Rajendra Navik, Aged About 20 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Working Under The Office Of Superintendent Of Police Kanker, P.S. Kanker, District North Bastar, Kanker, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Smt. Santoshi Shori, Wd/o Late Rohit Shori, Aged About 40 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Working Under The Office Of Deputy Inspector General Of Police, Kanker Attached With Superintendent Of Police, Kanker, P.S. Kanker, District North Bastar Kanker, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: The Secretary, Department Of Home Affairs, Police Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, P.S. Rakhi, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Secretary, Department Of Finance Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, P.S. Rakhi, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Director General Of Police, Police Head Quarters, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. D. I. G. (Administration), Police Head Quarters, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
5. The Director, Treasury, Audit And Account, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
6. The Superintendent Of Police, Kanker, P.S. Kanker, District North Bastar, Kanker, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

Shri Pravin Kumar Tulsyan, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri R.K.Gupta, Dy.A.G. for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

04/10/2016

Heard on admission.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are working in the police department as Assistant Sub-Inspector (M). The grievance of the petitioners 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 petitioners submit fresh representation before the competent authority, their case shall be scrutinized and if after due verification, it is found that their case is 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 petitioners in whose favour, Annexure P-1 has been passed, within a period of one month from today, the competent authority shall scrutinize their case and if on 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