

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 9339 of 2019**

Chandrashekhar Prahlad Joshi S/o Late Shri Prahlad Joshi, Aged About 63 Years (Working As Assistant Grade III Retired) Office Of Chief Engineer, Mahanadi Project, Irrigation Department Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh,

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh,
2. The Under Secretary, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. The Engineer-In-Chief, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Project, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Project, Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. The Superintending Engineer, Water Resources Department, Raipur Chhattisgarh,
6. The Executive Engineer, Water Resources Department, Raipur Division Raipur Chhattisgarh,
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Water Resources Division, Raipur Chhattisgarh,
8. The Joint Director, Treasury, Accounts And Pension, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Amit Kumar Sharma, Advocate

For Respondents/ State : Smt. Richa Shukla, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****15/11/2019**

1. The grievance of the Petitioner in the present writ petition is that the service rendered by the Petitioner as contingency paid employee before he was regularized in the department under the respondents, should also be

counted as qualifying service for the purpose of pension.

2. The issue raised in the present writ petition stands squarely covered by the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of “Lakhanram Sahu & other Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others” WA No. 281 of 2013 and other analogous appeals, decided on 26.02.2015.
3. In addition, it is also relevant to take note of the fact that the Finance Department of the State of Chhattisgarh vide a circular No. 8 of 2018, dated 28.02.2018 have held that the period of the Daily wage employee, who has been regularized subsequent to 01.11.2004, his past service as daily wage employee would also be treated as pensionable service.
4. In view of the aforesaid factual matrix of the case, this Court is of the opinion that ends of justice would meet if this writ petition itself is disposed off with a direction to the respondent No. 4 to take all necessary steps to ensure that the service rendered by the Petitioner as daily wage employee and if the Petitioner has been as a daily wage employee itself regularized in the department, then his period rendered as daily wage employee may also be treated as pensionable service.
5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge