

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**REVP No. 35 of 2018**

Chhattisgarh Madhyamic Shiksha Mandal, through its Secretary, Pension Bada, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner/Respondent No. 2

Versus

1. Sheikh Mohammad Safi Qureshi, S/o Late shri Sheikh Nasiruddin, Aged about 62 years, Retired as Assist Grade-II, Chhattisgarh Madhyamic Shiksha Mandal, Pension Bada, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. R/o YA06, Yash Vihar Moti Nagar Boriya Road, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. **-- Respondent No. 1/Petitioner**

2. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, School Education Department, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3. Employees Provident Fund, Commissioner, Regional Office Block D, Scheme No. 32, Indira Gandhi Vyavsaik Parisar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

4. Chhattisgarh Infrastructure Development Corporation, Raipur, Through its Managaing Director, Near Old Mantralaya, Ghari chowk, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondents

Order on Board

1. This review petition has arisen out of the order dated 04/01/2018 by which this Court had directed the petitioner herein to consider and grant retiral benefits to respondent No. 1 as directed by the State Government within 30 days.

2. It is stated at the Bar that pursuant to that order passed by this Court, the case of the respondent No. 1 has been considered by the petitioner and he has been extended the benefits of leave encashment, General Provident Fund, EWF and other retiral dues for which he was entitled to, which the respondent No. 1 has refused on the ground that benefit of pension and gratuity is not being given to him.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the case of respondent No. 1 has been considered and most of the retiral benefits to which he is entitled to

have already been determined and offered to him but respondent No. 1 has refused to accept these benefits and so far as the benefits of pension and gratuity are concerned, respondent No. 1 is not entitled to get the same.

4. As such, the order dated 04/01/2018 passed by this Court is very much clear and there is no error apparent on the face of the record.

5. Accordingly, this review petition stands disposed of. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinions on the merits of the matter.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

Harneet