

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO.556 OF 2019**

Smt. Anjulata Dubey W/o Shri Manoj Kumar Dubey Aged About 37 Years
R/o Om Nagar, Urla, Behind Sitla Temple, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Commissioner -Cum- Director Through Panchayat, Sanchanalaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Chief Executive Officer Through Jila Panchayat, Durg, District- Durg (CG).

... **Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner	:	Shri SS Baghel, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Jitendra Pali, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

28.01.2019

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 petitioner(s) shall be entitled to obtain the benefit of revised pay-scale on completion of 8 years service by including the services rendered by him / her on a lower post or on the same post.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there appears to be some discrepancy at the respondent's level so far as the actual date of appointment of the the petitioner is concerned.
4. The petitioner would be entitled to apprise the respondents in this regard by the documents that she has to show that her actual date of appointment was infact of the year, 2011 and not 2013 and thereafter the authorities would pass a fresh order in accordance with the directions given by this court in case of Mukesh Kumar Patel (Supra).
5. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge