

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2278 of 2017

- Pooran Lal Namdeo (P.L. Namdeo) S/o Late Shri Peela Lal Namdeo, Aged About 72 Years, Retired - Head Clerk (M) Under the Office of Superintendent of Police, Dhamtari, District-Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh, Resident Of Kelabadi, P. S. Kotwali, District - Durg Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Home and Police Affairs, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Finance Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Director General Of Police, Police Head Quarter, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. The Joint Director, Treasury, Account And Pension, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Dhamtari, District - Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	Shri Prakash Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondent-State	Shri S. P. Kale, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

16/05/2017

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was working as Head Clerk (M). His 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 have 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, his case shall be scrutinized and if after due verification, if it is found that his case is similar, he shall be entitled to all such benefits available to him 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 his 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, he would be at liberty to move afresh before this Court.

Sd/-

JUDGE
PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA

Nirala