

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 6266 of 2019**

Dinesh Kumar Sharma S/o Shri R. N. Upadhyay Aged About 61 Years
Asstt. Grade- III, C/o Executive Engineer, E&M, HEMM Division, Water
Resources Department, Rudri, R/o H/55, Irrigation Colony, Rudri District-
Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.- 493773., District : Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Mantralya, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh.- 492002., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Engineer-In-Chief Water Resources Department, Sihawa Bhawan, Civil Lines, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.- 492001., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Executive Engineer Water Resources Department, E&M, HEMM Division Rurdri, Dhamtari District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.- 493773, District : Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. B. P. Rao, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****20.08.2019**

1. The grievance of the petitioner is non granting of annual increment on completion of one year service from the initial date of appointment.
2. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that in the light of the judgment passed by this Court in WPS No. 841/2010 and WPS No. 844/2010 which were disposed of on 24.02.2011, the State Govt. has extended the benefit to similarly placed persons. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the State authorities are extending the benefits only to

those persons who are getting the order from the High Court and not otherwise.

3. State counsel, at this juncture, submits that subject to verification of facts whether the claim of the petitioner is identical in nature to the said similarly placed persons who have been granted the benefits in the very same department, the petition of the petitioner can be disposed.
4. Given the aforesaid statement made by the counsel appearing on either side, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the petition pending, rather ends of justice would meet if the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents 2 & 3 to verify the factual contents as stated in the preceding paragraphs and also verify whether identically placed persons have been extended the benefit or not and take appropriate steps so far as the petitioner is concerned. The petitioner would be at liberty to make fresh representation to the respondents 2 & 3.
5. Let this exercise be completed within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge