

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPL No. 85 of 2020

1. Chhattisgarh Rajya Gramin Bank Through The Chairman Mahadev Ghat Road, Sundar Nagar, Raipur, C.G. 492013
2. The Regional Manager, Chhattisgarh Rajya Gramin Bank Regional Office, Raigarh, Mithumude Road, Kabir Chowk, Raigarh Chhattisgarh. 496001.

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. Santosh Kumar Pare, R/o Railway Banglapara, Near Vivekanand School, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh 496001
2. The Appellate Authority Under The Payment Of Gratuity Act And The Deputy Labour Commissioner (C), Government of India, Ministry of Labour And Employment, Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Controlling Authority And The Regional Labour Commissioner (C) Bilaspur, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

-----Respondents

with

WPL No. 86 of 2020

1. Chhattisgarh Rajya Gramin Bank Through - The Chairman Mahadev Ghat Road, Sunder Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh. 492013
2. The Regional Manager, Chhattisgarh Rajya Gramin Bank Regional Office, Raigarh, Mithumude Road, Kabir Chowk, Raigarh, Chhattisgarh. 496001

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. Rudra Narayan Sharma, R/o - At - 9/107, Madhuwah Modipara, Near Vivekanand School, Ward No. -9, District - Raigarh Chhattisgarh. 496001
2. The Appellate Authority, Under The Payment of Gratuity Act And The Deputy Labour Commissioner (C), Government of India, Ministry of Labour And Employment, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3. The Controlling Authority and The Regional Labour Commissioner (C)
Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

----- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Pankaj Singh, Advocate.
For Respondents	:	Mr. Kashi Nath Nande, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

18.09.2020

1. Since the issue involved in both the writ petitions are identical and similar in nature. Both these writ petitions are being disposed off by this common order.
2. The impugned order under challenge in the present writ petitions are similar orders passed by the same authority which came up before this Court for consideration in the recent past in a bunch of writ petitions, the leading of which was WPL No. 55 of 2020. This Court had rejected the petition of the bank vide judgment dated 31.08.2020. The question of law involved in the present case being identical, the present writ petitions also stand decided in terms of the order passed in WPL No. 55 of 2020 decided on 31.08.2020.
3. Let a copy of the judgement passed in WPL 55 of 2020 be made part of this order.
4. As a consequence, both these writ petitions would stand rejected.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge**