

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPURWrit Petition (S) No.4113 of 2013

Mukund Singh Kanwar, S/o Shri Chandan Singh Kanwar, Age about 72 years, R/o Kasirpara, Sakti, P.S. Sakti, Distt. Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Agriculture Department, Naya Raipur, Mantralay, Raipur (C.G.)
2. State of M.P., Through Secretary, Agriculture Department, Wallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.)
3. Director of Agriculture, Agriculture Department, Raipur (C.G.)
4. Accountant General, Pagariya Complex, Pandari, Raipur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner: Mr. S.P. Kale, Advocate.

For Respondents No.1 and 3 / State of Chhattisgarh: -

Mr. Animesh Tiwari, Deputy Advocate General and
Mr. Soumya Rai, Panel Lawyer.

For Respondent No.4: -

Mr. Rajkumar Gupta, Central Govt. Counsel.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

04/10/2021

1. Mr. S.P. Kale, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, would submit that the petitioner, who now stands retired from service, was terminated from service from the post of Agriculture Development Officer on 13-1-1995 and despite that he is entitled for pension which has not been considered and granted by the State of M.P. and he is entitled for pension by virtue of Section 49 read with clause 2 of the Sixth Schedule of the Madhya Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2000 for which he had already made several representations, but the same have not been considered and decided, therefore, he may be allowed

to make fresh representation along with supporting documents to respondent No.2 within four weeks from today and which may be considered and decided.

2. Be that as it may, the petitioner is permitted to file a fresh representation along with requisite documents for pension before respondent No.2 within four weeks from today and that being so respondent No.2 shall consider and decide the same within a period of further six weeks from the date of receipt of representation by passing a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law.
3. Mr. Kale, learned counsel for the petitioner, would further submit that copy of this order be sent to the State of M.P. / respondent No.2, as the State of M.P. is not represented before this Court, though it is party respondent herein.
4. The prayer is fair and reasonable.
5. A copy of this order be sent to respondent No.2 for compliance.
6. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge