

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1288 of 2019

Jayant Kumar Tandan S/o Pundas Tandon Aged About 37 Years Lecturer
Panchayat Govt. H.S.S. Tamaseoni, Block Abhanpur ,district Raipur
Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development, Sanchanalaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat District Durg Chhattisgarh., District : Durg, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Dhamtari Chhattisgarh., District : Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Shalvik Tiwari, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Mishra, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

25/02/2019

Ignoring the default pointed out by the Registry, with the consent of the parties matter has been heard on admission.

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 2013 and taking both the services, the petitioner has completed more than 8 years of service and therefore he 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

Rohit