

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 2973 of 2005**

1. Prakash Dewangan, Aged about 36 years, S/o. Late Dashrath Lal Dewangan, Draftsman
2. Ashutosh Agrawal, Aged about 35 years, S/o. Late G.L. Agrawal, Technical Assistant
3. B.R. Ghritlahre, Aged about 36 years, S/o. Late Sukdev Ghritlahre, Technical Assistant
4. Smt. Anamika Tiwari, Aged about 31 years, W/o. Ramesh Kumar Tiwari, Technical Assistant
5. P.R. Ahir, Aged about 37 years, S/o. Late Pyarelal Yadav, Lab Technician
6. Vikram Khandvekar, Aged about 36 years, S/o. V.G. Khandvekar, Skilled Assistant
7. Smt. Sunita Sangeet, Aged about 33 years, W/o. Madan M. Sangeet, Skilled Assistant.

All above are working at Government Mahila Polytechnic, Raipur (at present Raipur Mahila Polytechnic, Raipur), Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Madhya Pradesh, through: Principal Secretary, Jan Shakti Niyojan Vibhag, Secretariat, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh
2. Director, Technical Education, Secretariat Madhya Pradesh, Satpuda Bhawan, Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh
3. Principal, Govt. Mahila Polytechnic (Now Raipur Mahila Polytechnic), Bairon Bazar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Sameer Uraon, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. R.N. Pusty, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****10/09/2018**

1. The case of the petitioners case when the original application before the State Administrative Tribunal was filed, was that the petitioners' services of the adhoc engagement for the period between 1989, till they were granted regular appointment in 1995, be also treated for the

purpose of seniority and the petitioners be granted regular pay scale and other benefits.

2. Pending the petition, the petitioners have meanwhile been granted the benefit of seniority, in as much as the petitioners' seniority is being now counted from the initial date of appointment on adhoc basis i.e. in the year 1989 onwards.
3. The counsel for the petitioners at this juncture submits that the only grievance left is that the petitioners should also be paid salary for the break, which the petitioners were granted during the course of adhoc employment.
4. Undisputedly, once when the petitioners have been granted seniority from the date of initial appointment, the entire service period would be counted as qualifying service for all practical purposes.
5. The petitioners in the opinion of this Court would not be entitled for any additional benefit for the intervening period, particularly the monetary benefits for the alleged break in service, which according to the petitioners at times was for a period of couple of months.
6. The said relief would not be sustainable for the reason that the petitioners have already been granted the benefit of seniority from the date of initial appointment on adhoc basis.
7. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed off holding that the petitioners would not be entitled for anything else, other than what has already been granted.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge