

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 5446 of 2016

Smt. Pushpa Paikra D/o Late Natwar Sai Paikra, Aged About 35 Years W/o Shri Sevak Prasad Paikra, Caste- Kanwar (S T), R/o Village Ulakiya, Police Station & Tahsil Sitapur, Civil & Revenue District Sarguja, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Ltd. (C S P D C L) Through Its Chairman Regd Office At Energy Info Tech Centre, Daganiya, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Chhattisgarh State Power Holding Company Ltd, Through Its Director General Manager (H R D) Regd Office At Energy Info Tech Centre, Daganiya, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Superintendent Engineer, (& M), Chhattisgarh State Power Generation Company Ltd., H B H P S, Machadoli (Bango), District Korba, (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Executive Engineer, Human Resources, Office Of Superintendent Engineer (& M), Chhattisgarh State Power Generation Company Ltd., H B H P S, Machadoli (Bango), District Korba, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri DineshTiwari, Advocate
For Respondents	:	Shri B.D. Guru, Advocate, on advance copy

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

Order On Board

04/10/2016

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this matter is covered by the decision rendered by this Court in WPS No.363 of 2015 (*Amit Rao Vs. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Ltd. & Ors*), decided on 6.5.2015, in which this Court has held in paragraph 4 as under :-

“ 4. After hearing learned counsel appearing for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners' cases are also required to be considered in accordance with the policy dated 30.1.1997 and for that matter the order passed by this Court in Raja Ram Kosle (supra) and other connected matters shall also apply in the present batch of writ petition.”

2. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the claim of the petitioner would be examined and scrutinized upon verification of case as to whether the petitioner's case is also similarly situated or not.
3. In view of the aforesaid submission, this petition is disposed off with a direction to the respondents to examine the case of the petitioner and if petitioner is found to be similarly situated as the petitioners in WPS No. 363 of 2015, similar consideration may be given to the claim of the petitioner also.

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