



2026:CGHC:13303

**NAFR****HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 5196 of 2021**

Guniram S/o Firtu Aged About 60 Years Judicial Labour, R/o Khudmudi, Tehsil Chhuikhadan, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh. **... Petitioner**

**versus**

**1-** State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**2-** Executive Engineer, Water Resources Department, Sub Division Durg, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

**3-** Sub Divisional Officer, Water Resources Department, Sub Division Chhuikhadan, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh, District : Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

**... Respondent(s)**

|                         |                                               |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <b>For Petitioner :</b> | None in two rounds.                           |
| <b>For State :</b>      | Mr. Suyashdhar Badgaiyya, Government Advocate |

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey****Order on Board****19/03/2026**

1. None for the petitioner in two rounds.
2. The petitioner has filed this petition seeking the following reliefs:—

**“10.1** That, the Hon'ble Court be pleased to set-aside the impugned orders (Annexure P-1) and may kindly be pleased to direct the



respondent authorities to consider the age of superannuation of the petitioners as 62 years.

**10.2** That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief, as it may deems fit and appropriate.”

3. It appears that the petitioner was engaged as a daily-rated employee vide order dated 17.04.1998 in the office of respondent No. 3, and thereafter, he was disengaged from service on 14.02.2000. A dispute was raised before the learned Labour Court, and an award was passed in favour of the petitioner/workman on 07.01.2006, thereafter he was reinstated. The petitioner completed the age of superannuation, i.e., 60 years, and thereafter Order dated 22.07.2021 (Annexure P/1) was issued.
4. After the date of retirement, the petitioner has preferred this petition seeking a direction to the respondent authorities to extend the age of superannuation from 60 to 62 years.
5. Admittedly, the petitioner was a daily-rated employee. The rules annexed along with the petition have been framed for contingency-paid employees and are not applicable to the petitioner, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to derive any benefit from those rules. Since, the petitioner has already attained the age of superannuation and this petition has been filed after the date of retirement, in my opinion, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.
6. Accordingly, this petition fails and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

Rakesh Mohan Pandey

**JUDGE**

Nadim