

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 7580 of 2018**

Sannu Ram S/o Late Shri Lohra Ram, Aged About 71 Years,
Occupation- Retd. Gangman, R/o Village And Post- Keradih, Thana-
Narayanpur, Tahsil- Kunkuri Civil And Revenue District- Jashpur,
Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Public Works Department,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Executive Engineer, Public Works Department, Jashpur, District-
Jashpur, Chhattisgarh
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Public Works Department, Sub Division-
Kunkuri, District- Jashpur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Shri Sunil Sahu, Advocate.
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jian, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

19/11/2018

1. The case of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that he was initially engaged as a daily wage employee under the respondents way back in the year 1979. The services of the petitioner stood regularized on 2002. Finally, the petitioner on attaining the age of 62 years stood retired from service in the year 2008. Though more than 10 years have passed, the petitioner has not been granted the benefit of pension.
2. At this juncture, counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue involved in the present case stands squarely covered by the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of Lakhanram Sahu and

others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others decided on 26.02.2015 in Writ Appeal No. 281 of 2013.

3. Considering the fact that the petitioner as such has put more than 6 years of regular service by itself in the opinion of this Court entitles him for pensionary benefits as the qualifying service for pension which was earlier 10 years has been reduced by the Department to 6 years. Moreover, now the State Govt. itself as a policy decision has decided to also count the services rendered as a daily wage employee for the purpose of counting the length of service while deciding the pension payable to an employee.

4. Given the aforesaid facts, let the case of the petitioner be considered and decided by respondent no.2 and necessary order be passed at the earliest preferably within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE