

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 5506 of 2017

- Shamim Akhtar Ansari S/o Late Shri Mohd. Jahoor Ansari, Aged About 51 Years R/o Gangaram Talab Ward No. 7 Indiranagar Raigarh District Raigarh Civil & Revenue District Raigarh Chhattisgarh. **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Transport, Mahanadi Bhavan Mantralay Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration & Development Mahanadi Bhavan Mantralay Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Commissiner , Urban Administration & Development Directorate, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. The Municipal Corporation, Through The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Raigarh District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.
5. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, Through Its Managing Director C I D C Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
6. Divisional Manager, Chhattisgarh. Infrastructure Development Department, Divisional Office, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh. **---- Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Mr. Rajendra Tripathi, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. S. P. Kale, Dy. A. G.
For respondent-Corporation	:	Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate
For respondent-CIDC	:	Mr. Sameer Behar, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order on Board

23/10/2017

Heard

1. The petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents to absorb the petitioner in service on the ground of being the employee of the

erstwhile Madhya Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation (for short 'the MPSRTC'). Further, the petitioner may be considered for absorption in service of Nagar Palika Parishad, Baikunthpur according to the decision taken by the State Government in respect of absorption of employees of the erstwhile MPSRTC/CIDC.

2. The brief facts, as projected by the petitioner, are that the petitioner was an employee of the erstwhile MPSRTC as he was appointed on the post of Conductor on 25-07-1991.
3. The erstwhile MPSRTC was dissolved w.e.f. 31-12-2002 vide notification dated 26-12-2002. The staff was to be divided on the basis of "as is, where is" basis, as on 01-11-2000. The petitioner was working within the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Chhattisgarh.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been denied absorption, against the policy decision of the State Government as enshrined in Rules of absorption for absorbing erstwhile MPSRTC employees in different Corporations and Departments in the State Government.
5. Shri Tripathi further submits that the aforesaid issue came up for consideration before this Court in A.K. Dwivedi Vs. State of C.G. & Others passed in WPS No. 4245/10 decided on 06/08/10/. This Court, after having considered the facts, passed the order as under :

"Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the policy of Absorption, the Rule of Absorption framed by the State Government in the matter of absorption of employees of erstwhile MPSRTC and further that large number of similarly situated employees have already been absorbed in various departments of the Government in implementation of the Absorption Policy and that the petitioner is going to retire on 31st August, 2010, it is directed that the case of the petitioner for absorption shall be considered by the concerned respondent authorities, strictly in accordance with the Rules of Absorption framed by the respondent No. 1, as expeditiously as possible."

6. It is further submitted that the order passed in A.K. Dwivedi (Supra), has further been clarified in Review petition No. 97/2010 (State of

Chhattisgarh & Others Vs. A. K. Dwivedi & Another) decided on 27-08-2010 to the effect that there was no direction for absorption in a particular department or institute.

7. Learned State counsel agrees with the submission, as aforesaid, and submit that the same order may be passed in this case also.

8. Having regard to the facts, situation of the case, as aforesaid, the respondent authorities may consider absorption of the petitioner in accordance with the rules of absorption and policy decision of the State, as ordered in A.K. Dwivedi (Supra).

9. In view of the above, the writ petition is finally disposed off. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

Judge