

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 1777 of 2019**

Shiv Kumar Agrawal S/o Ghanshyam Das Agrawal Aged About 43 Years
 Posted As Lecturer Panchayat, Goverment Higher Secondary School
 Kotmi Kala, Block Pendra, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District :
 Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Commissioner Cum Director Directorate Of Panchayat, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Kota, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****15/03/2019**

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 **petitioners** 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.
3. No order as to costs.
4. Any decision by the respondent authorities would be subject to the verification of the facts so far as the entitlement of the petitioner is concerned.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge