

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 2252 of 2011**

S.B. Gupta, S/o. Shri Deo Sharan Gupta, Aged about 63 Years, Executive Engineer (Retd.), CSEB, Presently R/o. SKS Guest House, Barrier Chowk, Kharsiya, District Raigarh (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Union of India, Through Its Secretary, Ministry of Power, Shram Shakti Bhawan, Rafi Marg, New Delhi
2. The State Advisory Committee, Through its Chairman/Secretary, Electricity Board, Room No. 63, Mantralaya, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal, (Madhya Pradesh)
3. Chhattisgarh State Power Holding Company Limited, (A successor company of C.S.E.B.) Through its Secretary, Vidyut Seva Bhawan, Danganiya, Raipur (C.G.)
4. The Executive Director (HR), Chhattisgarh State Power Holding Company Limited, (A successor company of C.S.E.B.) Vidyut Seva Bhawan, Danganiya, Raipur (C.G.)
5. Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board, Through its Secretary, Shakti Bhawan, Rampur, Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Pragallabh Sharma, Advocate.
 For Respondent No.1 : Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Standing Counsel for UOI
 For Respondents No. 3 & 4 : Mr. K.R. Nair, Advocate.
 For Respondent No. 5 : Mr. Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate.

Order On Board**09/05/2018**

(1) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was working as Superintending Engineer in Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board (henceforth "CSEB"), he retired on 30.6.2005 and after his retirement he was getting pension from CSEB, but without taking into consideration the fact that he retired from CSEB and getting pension from CSEB, all of a sudden, his pension records have been transferred to Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board (henceforth "MPSEB") against his will by respondent No. 4 by impugned order dated

23.05.2009 and now he is getting less pension from MPSEB, against which he has already made representation before respondent No. 4 on 13.12.2010, which has not been considered and decided till this date, against which the instant writ petition has been filed by the petitioner questioning the same.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the respective respondents would oppose the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

(3) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the impugned order with utmost circumspection.

(4) After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner was working as Superintending Engineer in CSEB, he retired on 30.06.2005 and after retirement he was getting pension from CSEB, but all of a sudden after three years of retirement, his pension records have been transferred to MPSEB by respondent No. 4 by impugned order dated 23.05.2009 as per his submission against his will by which he is getting less pension from MPSEB and further taking into consideration the age of the petitioner i.e. 70 years, it would be expedient to direct respondents No. 1 & 2 to consider the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. The petitioner is at liberty to make additional representation, if any, before respondent authorities in support of his case.

(5) With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

