

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 8146 of 2018**

1. Sunita Dewangan W/o Arvind Kumar Dewangan Aged About 35 Years Working As Lecturer Panchayat, Govt. High School, Dumar, Block Dhamdha, District Durg Chhattisgarh.
2. Kamlesh Kumar Gayakwad S/o Baijlal Gayakwad, Aged About 35 Years Working As Lecturer Panchayat Govt. Higher Secondary School, Kehaka, Block Saja, District Bemetara Chhattisgarh.
3. Rama Surywanshi W/o Chhannu Lal Suruyawanshi Aged About 34 Years Working As Lecturer Panchayat, Govt. Higher Secondary School, Dhaurabhatha, Block Patan, District Durg Chhattisgarh.
4. Rubydas W/o Himanshu Kumar Das Aged About 41 Years Working As Lecturer Panchayat, Govt. Higher Secondary School, Dhaurabhatha, Block Patan, District Durg Chhattisgarh.
5. Kusum Singh W/o Vikash Singh Aged About 42 Years Working As Lecturer Panchayat, Govt. Higher Secondary School, Jamgaon, Block Patan, District Durg Chhattisgarh.
6. Dileshwar Patel S/o Bhana Ram Patel Aged About 34 Years Working As Teacher Panchayat, Govt. Middle School, Bijaura, Block Dondilohara, District Balod Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Commissioner Cum Director Directorate Of Panchayat, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat, Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat, Bemetara, District Bemetara Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer Jila Panchayat, Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh.

----Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****10/12/2018**

1. Learned counsel for the parties would submit that the issue raised in this petition is squarely covered by order dated 28.11.2017

passed by this Court in WPS No.2530 of 2017 (Mukesh Kumar Patel and another Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and another) and batch of petitions wherein the circular dated 23.04.2016 has been quashed, petitions allowed and it has been declared that the petitioners therein shall be entitled to obtain the benefit of revised pay-scale on completion of 8 years service by including the services rendered by them on a lower post or on the same post.

2. In view of the aforesaid submission and the impugned order and action is based on circular dated 23.04.2016 which has been quashed in the case referred to herein above, the petition also deserves to be allowed with the direction that the **petitioners** shall be entitled to obtain the benefit of revised pay-scale on completion of 8 years service by including the services rendered **them** on a lower post or on the same post.
3. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge