

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 6346 of 2019

Smt. Leena Taunk W/o Ketan Taunk Aged About 43 Years Working As Lecturer (Panchayat) At Govt. Higher Secondary School, Khapri (S), Block Bhatapara, District- Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh., District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, District- Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh., District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Govind Dewangan, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Dy. A.G.

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

21/08/2019

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 on the ground 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 Nagariya Nikay and subsequently applied for recruitment on the higher post under the Panchayat Department 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