

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 33 of 2019**

Yudhishtir Pareshwar S/o Mr. Prahlad Pareshwar Aged About 34 Years
Lecturer (Nagriya Nikay), Govt. Pt. Vishnuprasad Sharma H.S. S.
Govindpur Kanker District- U.B. Kanker, Chhattisgarh., District : Kanker,
Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Director Urban Administration And Development Department, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat, South Bastar, Dantewada, Chhattisgarh., District : Dantewada, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Shri Parag Kotecha, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Jitendra Pali, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

08/01/2019

Ignoring the default pointed out by the Registry with the consent of the parties matter heard finally at motion stage.

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 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 Urban Administration Department and subsequently applied for recruitment on the higher post under the Panchayat Department in the year 2013 and taking both the services, the petitioner has completed more than 8 years of service and therefore he 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.

Rohit

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE