

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**W.P.S. NO. 6490 OF 2018**

Mithala Prasad Sharma, S/o Late Shri Rajbahor Sharma, aged about 72 years, Conductor, Korba Depot, R/o Village & Post- Shivrajpur, Tahsil & P.S. Naigarhi, District Rewa (M.P.)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation (Parivahan Prabhadh), Headquarter, through its Managing Director, Old PHQ Bhawan, Civil Line, P.S. Civil Line, District Raipur (CG)

2. Madhya Pradesh Road Transport Corporation, through its Managing Director, Head Office, Habibganj, Bhopal (M.P.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vivek Kumar Agrawal, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Soumya Rai, Advocate, under instructions of Mr. Ashish Shrivastava, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****01/10/2018**

1. Counsel for the petitioner submits that an identical issue came up for hearing before a coordinate Bench of this Court on 15.11.2017 and the same has been disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to make a fresh representation to respondent No.2 and it was further directed that respondent No.2 shall on receipt of the representation take a prompt decision.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition also may be disposed of in similar terms as the grievance raised by the petitioners is identical.

3. Given the facts and circumstances, this Court feels the prayer made by the petitioner to be fair and reasonable.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition also is disposed of in similar terms as has been passed in the W.P.S. No. 6005/2017 vide order dated 15.11.2017. Accordingly, the petitioners are at liberty to move a representation before respondent No.2 before whom the claim of the previous set of petitions were under process.

5. On submission of the representation by the petitioner, the respondents shall as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of two months shall verify and if the case of the petitioner is similarly to the previous set of petitions or the petitioners in the case of W.P.S. No. 6005/2017, his claim shall also be processed along with the similarly placed persons, whose writ petitions have already been decided vide orders dated 04.07.2011 and 16.12.2012 in WPS No. 6510/2009 and WA No. 419/2011.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of at the motion stage.

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

/sharad/