

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2927 of 2017

Ramratan Sahu S/o Shri Sonau Ram Sahu Aged About 66 Years R/o Village Hardi (Jarvea) Police Station Baloda, Tahsil Akaltara, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Chief Engineer, Hasdev Kachhar, Water Resources Department, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Light Machinery And Gate Sub Divisional Sakri, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Joint Director, Treasury, Accounts And Pension, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

Shri CJK Rao, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

10/07/2017

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was employee of work charged and contingency paid establishment, having been earlier appointed as daily wager and thereafter attained the status of temporary employee, in accordance with the Chhattisgarh (Work-Charged and Contingency paid Employees) Pension Rules, 1979 (for short 'the Rules, 1979'). The petitioner was regularized on 27.08.2008 and thereafter, retired on 30.04.2013.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the petitioner's past service, prior to the date of regularization, is not counted for the purposes of granting pension and as such, he has been declared ineligible for pension. Learned

counsel would refer to the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court decided on 26.2.2015 in Writ Appeal No.281/13 and other connected matters, wherein this Court has held that in view of the State Government's instructions dated 2.3.2005, petitioner's temporary service be taken into account to reckon pensionable service and the appellants of the said writ appeals were held entitled to pension under the Rules, 1979.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents would not dispute the legal decision as has been laid down by the Division Bench.

4. In view of above, the writ petition is disposed off with a direction that on fresh representation being filed by the petitioner within a period of 4 weeks, the respondents shall decide petitioner's entitlement to pension in accordance with the law laid down by this Court in Writ Appeal No.281/2013 within a further period of three months, subject to verification of facts or any other order passed by the Division Bench or the Supreme Court on the issue.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
JUDGE