

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CONT No. 712 of 2017**

1. Sukalu Ram Kanwar Gond S/o Tijau Gong, Aged About 66 Years
Occupation Retired Watchman, R/o Village Murmunda, Khallari, Tahsil
Dongargarh, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh, Chhattisgarh
2. Bhagwat Ram Patel Marar , S/o Sobhit Ram Marar, Aged About 65
Years Occupation Retired Watchman, R/o Dongargaon, Tahsil
Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh , District :
Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
3. Abhay Ram Sahu, S/o Sunhar Sahu, Aged About 62 Years Occupation
Retired Assistant Grade - I I I, R/o Tulsipur Ward No. 16,
Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh , District :
Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
4. Bharat Lal Dewangan, S/o Darshan Ram Dewangan, Aged About 61
Years Occupation Retired Peon, R/o Tulsipur Ward No. 16,
Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh , District :
Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

R. P. Mandal Secretary, Department Of Forest, Mantralaya Mahanadi
Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh , Chhattisgarh
....Respondent

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Ashok Patil, Advocate
For State/Respondent	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****25.01.2018**

Heard.

In this contempt petition, the petitioners alleged willful disobedience of the order passed by this Court on 19.06.2017 in WPS No.2402 of 2017. As the benefit of pension was not extended to the petitioners by considering the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Appeal No.281 of 2013 (Lakhanram Sahu and others vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others, the notices were issued, the respondents have filed their reply, additional affidavit

has been filed today. It shows that in the accounts of four petitioners, various CPF amount as pension benefits have been deposited.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are entitled to interest but the amount as claimed by the petitioners have not been deposited in their account.

3. While disposing off petitioners' petition, this Court had not quantified any amount relying upon the law laid down by this Court in the case of Lakhanram Sahu (supra), this Court directed the respondents to take a decision on petitioners' case. The respondents have examined the case of the petitioners and found the petitioners are entitled to contributory provident fund amount and they have deposited the amount in the accounts of each of the petitioners. If the petitioners' grievance is that the amount which has been deposited in their respective account is less than what they claimed, that cannot be gone into the contempt petition. The petitioners would be at liberty to separately claim any other amount over and above what has been provided to the petitioners under CPF.

4. With the said liberty, the contempt petition is closed and the Rule is discharged.

Sd/-

**(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge**