

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**W.P.S. NO. 5940 OF 2018**

1. Dilip Kumar Jain S/o Shri Ishwar Lal Jain Aged About 43 Years Government Cattle Disease Research Laboratory Kanker, Post And Thana Kanker District Kanker Chhattisgarh.
 2. Naresh Singh S/o Shri Manbahal Singh Aged About 44 Years Veterinary Office Kotela (Charama), Post And Thana Kanker District Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
 3. Vishnu Ram Sahu Shri Charan Singh Sahu Aged About 44 Years Veterinary Office Nagri, Pashu Aushdhalay Bailarbahar, Post And Thana Narharpur District Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
 4. Shatrughan Dewangan S/o Shri Chain Singh Dewangan Aged About 41 Years Veterinary Office Jamgaon, Post And Thana Narharpur, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
- ... Petitioners**

versus

1. State Government Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Veterinary Services, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
 2. Director, Department Of Veterinary Services , Indrawati Bhawan New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
 3. Joint Director, Department Of Veterinary Services, Jagdalpur District Bastar at Jagdalpur, Chhattisgarh.
 4. Deputy Director, Department Of Veterinary Services, Kanker, District Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
- ... Respondents**

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Somkant Verma, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****11/09/2018**

1. The limited grievance of the petitioners is that though on an earlier occasion the petitioners had filed a writ petition, i.e., W.P.S. No. 1246/2015, which was disposed of on 9.4.2015 with a direction to decide the representation of the petitioner, but the said representation of the petitioners could not fetch favour.
2. Meanwhile, similarly placed persons as that of the petitioners had filed a separate writ petition, i.e., W.P.S. No. 3652/2015, which was subsequently settled by the State Government in the Lok Adalat conducted by the High Court on 12.11.2016 and wherein the State Government had extended the relief to the petitioners therein.
3. Grievance of the petitioners now by the present writ petition is that, though the petitioners are identically placed but for reasons best known they

have been left out without assigning any reason as to why they are not entitled for the similar relief.

4. Counsel for the petitioners further submits that this Court in another writ petition, i.e., W.P.S. No. 3036/2018, vide order dated 20.8.2018, has also disposed of writ petition of similarly placed persons directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioners in the said writ petition at par with the persons who have been extended the benefit and if they are senior to those persons they should be granted the benefit and if not they should be suitably intimated as to why they would not be entitled for the same. The petitioners vide the present writ petition has prayed for a similar relief.

5. Considering the subsequent developments that have transpired particularly in the light of the relief granted to the petitioners in W.P.S. No. 3652/2015 and also the order passed by this Court in W.P.S. No. 3036/2018, this Court does not intend to keep the present writ petition pending, rather, ends of justice would serve if the writ petition stands disposed of, with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner also along with the petitioners in W.P.S. No. 3036/2018 and if the petitioners are found similarly placed and if the petitioners are entitled for similar relief, then appropriate relief be granted. If the petitioners are not entitled for any such relief then the petitioners should be suitably intimated as to why they would not be entitled for the benefits which have extended to the petitioners in W.P.S. No. 3652/2015.

6. Let this exercise be concluded within a period of three months from today.

7. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge