

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 4669 of 2017

Sakhi Chandra S/o Late Shri Shivrath, Aged About 63 Years H S C
L Colony, Maroda, Near Durga Mandir And Behind Manish
Fabrication, Maroda Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Directorate, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Through Its Director, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Indravati Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Municipal Corporation, Bhilai, Through Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Sourabh Sharma, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Manish Nigam, PL
For Corporation	:	Mr. Sudeep Agrawal, under instruction from Mr. Shivraj singh

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order on Board

23/11/2017

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner who was contingency employee and later on became regular on 13-10-2008. Thereafter, he retired in the year 2016. It is submitted that in view of the decision of the Division Bench in the case of **Lakhanram Sahu and others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others** in Writ Appeal No. 281 of 2013 and batch of cases vide order dated 26-02-2015. the services rendered by the deceased employee as temporary employee to the date of

regularization also entitled to be counted for the purpose of pension under pension rules of 1979.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent would submit that though there is quarrel in certain legal position, for entitlement to pension appropriate verification of facts would be necessary and on the basis of the same petitioners claim for pension shall be examined and orders would be passed.

3. On the submissions made, the petition is disposed off with the direction to examine the petitioner's entitlement for pension in accordance with the decision in the case of **Lakhanram Sahu and others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others** and extend the benefit to petitioner. The exercise should be completed within a period of 3 months.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

Judge