

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 4022 of 2021**

Umakant Sharma S/o Late Kamal Narayan Sharma, Aged About 61 Years, Revenue Sub Inspector, Zone- 06, Municipal Corporation, Purani Basti, P.S. Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department, Mantralaya At Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh 492002
2. Director, Directorate Of Urban Administration And Development Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh 492002
3. The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Tanmay Thomas, Advocate
For State/Respondents 1 & 2	:	Mr. Ishan Verma, P.L.
For Respondent no.3	:	Mr. Sandeep Dubey, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****05.08.2021**

1. The grievance of petitioner in the present writ petition seems to be the non-granting of the benefit of increment for the adhoc period of engagement that was given to the petitioner before regularization in service.
2. According to the petitioner, he was initially appointed on adhoc basis in the year 1983 and was subsequently regularized in service under the respondent no.3. The contention of petitioner is that the services

of petitioner have been regularized right from the date of initial engagement as adhoc appointee and that for the purpose of grant of pension the period of adhoc appointment also has been taken into consideration. Therefore, for all practical purposes he should have been granted the benefit of annual increment for the initial period of engagement as an adhoc employee till the date he was regularized in service which if granted, the retiral dues and the post retiral benefits that the petitioner is entitled for would be substantially enhanced.

3. Counsel for the petitioner at this juncture submits that the petitioner has already made a representation in this regard to the respondents and the same may be ordered to be decided on its own merits and also prays for liberty to file a fresh representation supported with all relevant documents and records in support of his contention.
4. This limited relief sought for by the petitioner is not opposed by the State counsel.
5. Accordingly, the writ petition at this juncture stands disposed of directing the petitioner to approach the respondent no.3 by a fresh representation in addition to any representation that he has already made. The respondent no.3 in turn shall consider and decide the same on its own merits strictly in accordance with the rules governing the field, at the earliest, preferably within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge