

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 469 of 2019

Santosh Kumar Sahu S/o Shri Baijnath Sahu Aged About 38 Years
Working As Lecturer (Panchayat) And Posted At Govt. Multipurpose Hr.
Secondary School Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Urban Administrative And Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahandi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Mungeli, Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.
4. Commissioner Municipal Corporation Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For petitioner	:	Ms. Arpana Singh, Advocate.
For respondent no. 4	:	Mr. Bhupendra Singh, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Sameer Behar, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

23/01/2019

1. 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.
2. The grievance of the petitioner was that the petitioner was initially appointed under the Urban Administration Department and subsequently

applied for recruitment on the higher post under the Panchayat Department in the year 2013 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.

3. 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.)**

4. 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).

5. 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.)**.

6. 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

Harneet