

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No.308 of 2017

Smt. Sushila Devi, W/o Late Shri Ramji Singh, aged about 66 years,
Resident of Bhartiya Nagar, P.S. Civil Lines, District-Bilaspur (CG)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Home Affairs, Police Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur (CG)
2. The Secretary, Finance, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur (CG)
3. The Director General of Police, Police Head Quarters, Raipur (CG)
4. The Commandant, 2nd C.G. Battalion, CAF, Sakri, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr.Palash Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Mr.Dhiraj Wankhede, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Manindra Mohan Shrivastava, J.

Order on Board

19/1/2017

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is working as Subedar (M). Her grievance is that despite order passed by this Court in W.P. No.4653/2006 and the order passed by Division Bench on 23/02/2011 in W.A. No.426/2011, against which, the Supreme Court has dismissed S.L.P. (Civil) No.13274/2013, the benefits made admissible to the similarly placed persons vide order 03/12/2013 issued by 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.

2. Learned State counsel would submit that in the event petitioner submits fresh representation before the competent authority, her case shall be scrutinized and if after due verification, if it is found that his case is similar, she shall be entitled to all such benefits available to her in accordance with law.
3. In view of the above, petition is disposed of with a direction that in the event petitioner submits fresh representation before the competent authority claiming similar treatment as has been extended to the previous set of petitioners in whose favour order dated 03/12/2013 has been passed, within a period of one month from today, the competent authority shall scrutinize her case and if on verification it is found that the petitioner is identically placed, necessary orders in this regard be passed in accordance with law within a further period of two months.
4. If any adverse order is passed against the petitioner, she would be at liberty to move a fresh before this Court.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge

B/-