

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 500 of 2019

Smt. Madhulika Shrivastav, aged about 47 years, W/o Shri Ashish Shrivastav presently posted as Lecturer (Nagri Nikay), at Government Girls High School, Bacheli, District South Bastar Dantewada (C.G.) R/o Type-II, Q. NO. 19, Bacheli, District South Baster Dantewada, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary Panchayat & Rural Development Department, Mantralaya, Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Deputy Secretary, Urban Administration & Development Department, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Chattisgarh.
3. Chief Municipal Officer, Municipal Council, Bade Bacheli, District South Baster Dantewada, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Waquar Naiyer, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Mishra, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

24/01/2019

1. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the default pointed out by the Registry has been removed. Hence, with the consent of the parties, the matter is being finally disposed of.
2. The dispute raised in the present writ petition is the non-consideration of the case of the petitioner for grant of revised pay scale on completion of 8 years of service. The denial to the petitioner was that the petitioner has not completed 8 years of service under the same employer.

3. The grievance of the petitioner was that the petitioner was initially appointed under the **Panchayat department** and subsequently applied for recruitment on the higher post under the **Municipal Council** in the **year 2012** and taking both the services, the petitioner has completed more than 8 years of service and therefore **she is entitled** for the benefit of higher pay scale.
4. The counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue involved in the present writ petition is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in a bunch of writ petitions disposed off on 27.10.2018. The lead case of which being **WPS No. 6147/2018 (Shabnum Khatun v. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.)**
5. This aspect is not disputed by the State counsel so far as the matter being similar to the one passed in the case of “**Shabnum Khatun**” (supra).
6. Given the facts and circumstances of the case the present writ petition also deserves to be and is accordingly disposed off in similar terms to the order passed in **WPS No. 6147/2018 (Shabnum Khatun v. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.)**.
7. The writ petition accordingly stands allowed. The petitioner would be entitled for the benefit as prayed for subject to the verification of the case by the Department.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Jyoti