

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 699 of 2019**

Smt. Vishakha Rautkar W/o Dilip Kumar Rautkar Aged About 41 Years Working As Lecturer Panchayat (Nagriya Nikay), Govt. Higher Secondary School, Naya Bazar, Rajhara, Block Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**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 Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Municipal Officer Balod, District Balod Chhattisgarh.

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Sameer Behar, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****04/02/2019**

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 [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.

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

Ved