

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3103 of 2017

1. Smt. Anamika Singh W/o Late Shri Rajesh Singh, Aged About 41 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Working Under The Office Of Respondent No. 3 And The R/o Head Quarter, Sector 19, District New Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. Anurag Toppo S/o Late Shri Mohar Sai Toppo, Aged About 25 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Working Under The Office Of Respondent No. 3 And The R/o Head Quarter, Sector 19, District New Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
3. Chitranjan Sahu, S/o Late Shri Ganesh Ram Sahu, Aged About 25 Years Occupation Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Working Under The Office Of Respondent No. 3 And The R/o Head Quarter, Sector 19, District New Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Home Affairs, Police Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. The Secretary, Finance, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
3. The Director General Of Police, Home Guards, (State Disaster Resolve Force) S D R F, Head Quarter, Sector 19, New Raipur, (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondents

Shri Palash Tiwari, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri S.P.Kale, Addl. A.G. for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

17/07/2017

Heard on admission.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the husband of petitioner No.1 and respective fathers of petitioner No.2 and 3 were working as Assistant Sub-Inspector (M), who died in harness. 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 petitioners. 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 cases are similar, they shall be entitled to all such benefits available to the, 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 order 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