

**MINUTES OF THE 7TH MEETING HELD ON 28.06.2008 AT 11.30 AM
AT RAIPUR UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF JS(A&AT&CS)**

In compliance with the directions dated 17.04.2007 of the Hon'ble High Court of Chhatisgarh at Bilaspur in Writ Petition No. 445/2001 in the matter of Godbole and others versus Union of India and others, the 7th meeting of the Committee was held under the Chairmanship of Dr S K Sarkar, Joint Secretary (A&AT and CS), DOPT at 11.30 A.M. Hrs at Raipur in Chhatisgarh. The meeting was attended by the following:-

Shri Jawahar Shrivastava, Secretary, GAD, Govt. of Chhatisgarh.
Shri Y. Satyam Additional Secretary, GAD, Govt. of MP
Shri V. Peddanna Deputy Secretary, Department of Personnel & Training

The Chairman welcomed the members of the Committee and thereafter took up the agenda of the meeting for discussion. In the meeting, the representations of State Government employees of erstwhile State of Madhya Pradesh, covered by the decision dated 17.04.2007 in W.P. No. 445/2001 and also connected were individually discussed for revision of their allocation of State Cadre. A total of 18 representations were considered in meeting. Brief record of discussion/decision in each case has been reflected in the last column of the Table.

	Name of the Petitioner	Petition No.	Decision taken
1	Jawahar Lal Sisodia, Sub Inspector	6591/05	Allocation on juniority basis to Chhatisgarh. Hence the Committee recommended for rejection to the request, as there are no grounds for consideration in this representation for revision of allocation.
2.	Bharat Singh, Lecturer (Math)	1322/08	Option was for Madhya Pradesh State but allocated to Chhatisgarh State on option basis (by mistake) Recommended for allocation to Madhya Pradesh based on his option to Madhya Pradesh.
3.	Ashok Kumar Saiyam	1322/08	Option was for Madhya Pradesh State but allocated to Chhatisgarh State based on option to Chhatisgarh by mistake Recommended for allocation to Madhya Pradesh based on his option to Madhya Pradesh.
4.	Mahender Kumar Gupta, Asstt.Gr.III	1323/08	Employee is non-State cadre. Non-State cadre employees are to be in the area where they are working at the time of bifurcation of the State of Madhya Pradesh. Hence recommended for rejection of the representation.
5.	A.K.Pandey, RADO	2024/08	Allocated to Chhatisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines - Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for

			revision of allocation.
6.	T.K.Diwan	2024/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
7.	Anil Kumar Pandey, RADO	1349/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
8.	Prakash Dubey, RADO	2024/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
9	Om Prakash Tiwari, RADO	2024/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
10.	Sudharshan Prasad Gaur, RADO	2024/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
11.	Mahesh Kumar Malviya, AMO	2039/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
12.	Harish Kumar Vijayvargai	2039/08	Allocated to Chhattisgarh on juniority basis as per the guidelines – Hence Committee recommended for rejection of the representation as there are no grounds for revision of allocation.
13.	Rajender Kumar Yadav, RADO	2024/08	Wife working in Madhya Pradesh State. Hence the Committee recommended that he may be allocated to Madhya Pradesh under spouse policy.
14	Chetan Lal Netam, Foreman Press	-	Option is for Chhattisgarh State. Hence the Committee recommended that he may be allocate to Chhattisgarh State.
15.	R.K.Sharma, RADO	1036/08	Allocated on juiority basis. Hence the Committee recommended for rejection of representation. Since as there are no grounds for consideration in this representation for revision of allocation.
16.	R.P.Shukla, Asstt.Surgen	6477/08	The representation of Dr.R.P.Shukla, Asstt.Surgeon has been considered by the Committee. The representatives of Animal Husbandry Department and Panchayati Raj Chhattisgarh have Stated that Dr.Shukla belongs to Animal Husbandry Department. The advocate representing Shri Shukla informed that the representation of Dr.

Mohinder Singh

			Shukla may be considered as per direction of the Hon'ble High Court. In view of the position the Committee directed both the State Govts, to verify the facts of the case and place before the next meeting of the Committee for its consideration.
17.	R.M.Patel, RADO	1035/08	This case was considered and deferred for want of information from the State of Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh and he may be called for personal hearing.
18.	Shri Ved Prakash Mishra RADO	6590/08	Deferred and directed to give an oppourtities the documents supporting the illness of his son.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

M. S. Singh