



2026:CGHC:3797

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 725 of 2026**

Khileshwari Ravte W/o Late Vasit Ravte Aged About 28 Years Occupation - Assistant Sub Inspector (M), Under The Office Of Superintendent Of Police Balod District- Balod (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Home Police Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Director General Of Police Police Head Quarters, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Superintendent Of Police Balod, District- Balod (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Deeksha Gauraha, Dy. Govt. Advocate

**S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge****Order on Board****22/01/2026**

1. Grievance raised by petitioner in this writ petition is that petitioner, who is working as Assistant Sub Inspector (M) under the respondents, is being denied grant of ad-hoc pay increase, which has been granted to other similarly placed persons but who were not in Ministerial cadre.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner would submit that grievance raised in present writ petition has already been adjudicated upon in favour of other similarly placed persons in Writ Petition (S) No. 4563 of 2006 [*Abdul Nawab Khan & Others v. The State of Chhattisgarh & Others*], decided on 7.5.2009. Order passed by this Court in Writ Petition (S) No. 4563 of 2006 has been affirmed even up till the stage of Supreme Court. Subsequently, another batch of petitioners filed writ petition bearing WP No. 4523/2014 [*Francis Xavier Back & Others v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*], and said writ petition also got disposed of on 3.7.2015, granting benefit which has been extended to other similarly placed persons in the light of decision rendered in case of Abdul Nawab Khan (supra). He prays that respondents may be directed to consider case of petitioner also in similar line.
3. Learned State Counsel does not oppose the same.
4. Accordingly, present writ petition is also disposed of in similar line as in case of *Francis Xavier Back & Others v. State of CG* decided on 3.7.2015 in WPS No. 4523/2014.
5. In case, subject to verification, if petitioner is found eligible, the relief, as sought for, may be granted to her forthwith and if respondents find that



petitioner is not entitled, she may be suitably intimated in this regard giving reasons for her non-entitlement.

6. Let this exercise be done within a period of 90 days from the date of petitioner's presenting certified copy of this order before respondent authorities.
7. With the aforesaid direction, the writ petition finally stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)

Judge

Praveen