

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 1463 of 2018**

Padamlochan Rath S/o Late Shri Gangadhar Rath Aged About 63 Years Retired Senior Steno, R/o Baradoli, Post Sendri, Via Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary Home (Police) Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Director General Of Police, Police Headquarter, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Superintendent Of Police, State Police Academy Chandkhuri, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Joint Director, Treasury Accounts And Pension, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Roshan Dubey, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Syed Majid Ali, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****09/07/2018**

1. Heard on admission.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner is a retired Senior Steno and is working under the respondent No.1. The grievance of the petitioner 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 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.

3. Learned State counsel would submit that in the event, the petitioner submits fresh representation before the competent authority, his case shall be scrutinized and if after due verification, it is found that his case is similar, he shall be entitled to all such benefits available to him in accordance with law.
4. In view of above, this petition is finally disposed off with a direction that in the event, the petitioner submits fresh representation before the competent authority claiming similar treatment as has been extended to the previous set of petitioners in whose favour, Annexure P-1 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.
5. If any adverse order is passed against the petitioner, he would be at liberty to move afresh before this Court.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge