

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 1525 of 2019

Bhupendra Kumar Sahu S/o Shri Bhanu Ram Sahu, Aged About 41 Years Working As Teacher (L.B.) And Posted At Govt. Middle School Gondwara, Block Dharsiwa, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Astha Shukla, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order on Board

06/03/2019

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 under Urban Administration Department 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