

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 8314 of 2018**

Rajeev Vaidya S/o Late Vasudev Prasad Vaidya Aged About 53 Years Presently Working As Sub Engineer In The Office Of Project Manager, A D B Project Raipur Division, R/o 12, Akash Nagar, Near By Gayatri Nagar, P O Shankar Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Public Works Department, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Engineer In Chief Public Works Department, Nirman Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Project Director A D B Project, Public Works Department, Sirpur Bhawan Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Project Manager A D B Project Raipur Division, Sirpur Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Shri Kishore Narayan, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri R. N. Pusty, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

14/12/2018

1. With the consent of the parties, the matter is taken up for hearing finally.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was initially appointed as Sub Engineer on ad hoc basis on 17.10.1986 against a clear vacant post. The services of the petitioner were continued with artificial break of two or three days in service and worked continuously till the date of his regularization. The petitioner was given the benefits of annual increments.
3. A similarly situated employees approached the State Administrative Tribunal (for short "SAT") in Original Application No. 1979 of 1991 (Satish Kumar Mandloi Vs State of M.P. and another) praying for similar relief as sought for in this petition. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that this case may also be disposed off in the same terms and conditions.

4.Learned counsel for the State in the light of the order of the SAT as aforestated, submits that after verifying the facts of the case, petitioner's case shall be considered.

5. In view of the foregoing and categorical statement made by the learned counsel appearing for the State, this petition is allowed in the same terms i.e. if the Committee finds the petitioner suitable for the post in all respect, he shall be regularized on the post held by him and shall also pay him salary on regular scale. He shall be entitled to salary for the dates on break in service. His seniority shall be counted from the date of his initial appointment.

6. No costs.

Rohit

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE