

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 3872 of 2026**

1 - Tula Ram Yadav S/o. Shri Manglu Ram Aged About 72 Years Retired (Carpenter), R/o. Village Bhelwadih, Block Kharsia, Dist.- Raigarh (C.G.)

... **Petitioner**

**Versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Public Works, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Engineer In Chief Department Of Public Works, Nirman North Block, Naya Raipur (C.G.)

3 - Chief Engineer Public Works Department Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur (C.G.)

4 - Executive Engineer Public Works Department Raigarh Division, District- Raigarh (C.G.)

5 - Joint Director Treasury, Account And Pension, Bilaspur, Distt.- Bilaspur (C.G.)

... **Respondents**

---

For Petitioner : Mr. Jeet Ram Patel, Advocate

For Respondents-State : Ms. Apurva Nigam, Panel Lawyer

---

**S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge**

**Order On Board**

**06/05/2026**

1. With the consent of learned counsel appearing for the parties, the case is heard finally.



2. The grievance of the petitioner in the writ petition is that the services rendered by the petitioner as daily wage employee before he was regularized in the department under the respondents, should also be counted as qualifying service for the purpose of pension.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the issue raised in the present writ petition is squarely covered by the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **"Lakhanram Sahu & others vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others"** WA No. 281/2013 and other analogous appeals, decided on 26.02.2015. In addition, it is also relevant to take note of the fact that the Finance department of the State of Chhattisgarh vide its Circular No.8/2018, dated 28.02.2018 has held that the period of the Daily wage employees, who have been regularized subsequent to 01.11.2004, their past services as daily wage employee would also be treated as pensionable service.
4. Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that case of petitioner is squarely covered by the decision of Division Bench in case of **Lakhanram Sahu** (supra) is not disputed by learned counsel for the respondents- State.
5. In view of the aforesaid factual matrix of the case, submission of learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that ends of justice would meet if this writ petition is disposed off with a direction to respondent No.2 to take all necessary steps to ensure considering claim of petitioner about the services rendered by him



2026:CGHC:21061

3

as daily wage employee and to pass appropriate order in accordance with law, keeping in mind decision in case of **Lakhanram Sahu** (supra) .

6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

**Sd/-**  
**(Parth Prateem Sahu)**  
Judge

Dey