

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 1527 of 2015**

Hameeda Begam W/o late Abdul Hamid Khan, aged about 62 years,
R/o Turkapara, Chandani Chauk, Raigarh, Tahsil & District Raigarh,
Civil and Revenue District Raigarh (CG)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, through Managing Director, Shashtri Chauk, Raipur, Tahsil & District Raipur (CG)
2. Divisional Manager, Infrastructure Development Corporation, Divisional Office, Old Bus Stand, Bilaspur Tahsil & District Bilaspur (CG).
3. Controlling Authority, under Payment of Gratuity Act, District Office, Raigarh, District Raigarh (CG)
4. Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri M. K. Sinha, Advocate
For State	:	Shri Ratan Pusty, Govt. Advocate
For Respondents 1 & 2	:	Himanshu Sinha, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****30.08.2018**

1. The whole issue involved in the present case is that there is an order dated 03.02.2006 passed by the Controlling Authority under the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 i.e. the Labour Officer, Labour Court, Raigarh who had allowed the claim application of the petitioner for

grant of gratuity for an amount of Rs.18,115/- which till date has not been paid to the petitioner.

2. There is no dispute of the fact that the deceased employee has not been paid this amount. Meanwhile, the deceased employee approached different forum for ventilating his grievance except for moving an execution case before the Controlling Authority which has passed the order.
3. Be that as it may, since it is undisputed that the petitioner is entitled for an amount of Rs.18,115/-, let necessary amount be paid by respondent no.2 to the petitioner within a period of 30 days from today. Needless to mention that if any amount earlier deposited anywhere has been withdrawn by the petitioner, the said amount would be adjusted and only the balance amount need paid to the petitioner, if not, the entire amount would be paid by respondent no.2. The respondent no.2 would have the liberty to recover any amount which they have deposited before any other forum and which still stands undisbursed.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**