

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURREVP No. 58 of 2018

Ramkishun Dhruv S/o Late Shri Kunwar Singh Dhruv, Aged About 50 Years Working As Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Magarlod, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Narendra Kumar Jain S/o Late Dharendra Kumar Jain, Aged About 64 Years R/o Amapara, Near Durga Mandir, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Collector, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For petitioner	: Mr. Ajit Singh, Advocate.
For Respondent 1	: Sanjeev Kumar Sahu, Advocate.
For State	: Rahul Mishra, Dy. G. A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

25/03/2019

1. The present Review Petition has been filed by the petitioner - the respondent No. 4 in the original writ petition in the capacity of Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Magarlod, District Dhamtari.
2. The dispute in the present review petition is the petition which was decided so far as the pensionary benefits that the petitioner therein namely Narendra Kumar Jain is concerned.
3. On perusal of the records, particularly, the grounds on which the review petition has been sought for this Court does not find these grounds to be strong grounds for entertaining the review petition as there does not appear to be an error worth entertaining the Review Petition. The direction by this Court was to the Chief Executive Officer of both Zila

Panchayat and Janpad Panchayat to process the claim of the petitioner namely Narendra Kumar Jain so far as the release of pensionary benefits are concerned. What this Court expected was that the claim of the petitioner shall be processed and they shall take a decision. Thus the direction given by this Court does not seem to be any manner innocuous as the direction to the respondents No. 3 & 4 was only to process the claim and take a decision either way, either holding the petitioner entitled for pension or holding not entitled for pension, so that only then could the petitioner have a grievance which he could have challenged by way of a fresh petition confined to the claim so far as pensionary benefits are concerned.

4. The present review petition thus being devoid of merits deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed with a direction to the applicant and respondent No. 4 to take a decision at the earliest.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE