

**HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH : JABALPUR  
LARGER BENCH - I (Time 2:30 PM)**

**Daily Cause List dated : 04-03-2025**

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI  
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VISHAL MISHRA**

**Court Hall No.: 1**

**NOTE:-** All the Advocates are requested to submit a list of cases, in which compromise/amicable settlement is possible in the forthcoming permanent & continuous Lok Adalat. The list of cases may be submitted in the office of M.P. High Court Legal Services Committee, Jabalpur or may also be sent through email mphclsc@gmail.com,sechclscjbp@mp.gov.in at the earliest.

In compliance of Court order dated 28.05.2024 passed in CRA 10947/2019 (Ram Singh Vs State of MP), it is to inform that Counsels cannot appear in Criminal Appeals on the basis of memo of appearance and they will have to necessarily file Vakalatnama. They may do so during the vacation, failing which, after vacation Hon'ble Court may not entertain appearance on the memo of appearance

**MOTION HEARING**

**[DIRECTION MATTERS]**

<b>SN</b>	<b>Case No</b>	<b>Petitioner / Respondent</b>	<b>Petitioner/Respondent Advocate</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>WP 17880/2022</b>	<b>UNION OF INDIA &amp; Ors.</b>  Versus <b>L.L. SHARMA &amp; Anr.</b>	<b>SAPAN USRETHER[R-1], VIJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI[R-2], SHRI PRAVEEN YADAV[R-2], SAMVEG TRIPATHI[R-2]</b>  <small>ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL-10100 - Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 (Matters Relating to CAT)-10101 - Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 (Matters Relating to CAT)-10101 Relief - KINDLY BE QUASHED HE ORDER DT. 04/05/2022 (ANNX. P-1) {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>TO CONSIDERED FOLLOWING QUESTION AS TO WHETHER THE EXPRESSION "FROM 80 YEARS TO LESS THAN 85 YEARS" WOULD INCLUDE AGES 79 YEARS ONE DAY TO 84 YEARS OR 80 YEARS AND ONE DAY TO 84 YEARS 11 MONTHS 30/31 DAYS, AS THE CASE MAY BE."</b> 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION</small>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Linked MP 05458/2024</b>	<b>UNION OF INDIA &amp; Ors.</b>  Versus <b>UMASHANKAR JOSHI &amp; Anr.</b>	<b>SANDEEP KUMAR SHUKLA[P-3], ANUJ SINGH[P-3]</b>  <b>ASHUTOSH JOSHI[R-1], ASHOK KUMAR PALI[R-1], DEEPAK KUMAR PANDEY[R-1], ANUBHAV SINGHAL[R-1]</b>  <small>ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL-10100 - Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 (Matters Relating to CAT)-10101 - Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 (Matters Relating to CAT)-10101 Relief - SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 04/01/2024 {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>FOR ADMISSION</b> 01-ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION</small>
<b>2</b>	<b>MP 04838/2024</b>	<b>MAHENDRA SHIVHARE</b>  Versus <b>MUNNI BAI &amp; Ors.</b>	<b>PRAMENDRA SINGH THAKUR DISHA SINGH, ADITYA SINGH RAJPUT, ANUPAM SONI</b>  <b>ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-13], MOHIT HANDA[R-1], SHREYA CHOURASIYA[R-1], DEEPAK SAHU[R-1], NITIN GUPTA[R-1], AYUSH SHIVHARE[R-1][R-2][R-2][R-2][R-2][R-3][R-3][R-3][R-3][R-4][R-4][R-4][R-4][R-4][R-4][R-5][R-5][R-5][R-5]</b>  <small>LAND REVENUE , TENANCY &amp; NAZUL-14600 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 - M.P. Land Revenue Code 1959-14620 Relief - QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 29/05/2023, 26/04/2024 {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>FOR ORDERS TO DECIDE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS- A. WHETHER IN VIEW OF SECTION 31 OF MPLR CODE READWITH THE NATURE OF JURISDICTION CONFERRED IN TERMS OF SECTION 257 THEREOF, REVENUE COURTS ARE "COURTS" AND NOT MERE QUASI JUDICIAL AUTHORITIES IN VIEW OF DIVISION BENCH JUDGMENT IN CASE OF DANGALIA VS. DESHRAJ, REPORTED IN 1973 MPLJ 796 AND WHETHER THE SUBSEQUENT DIVISION BENCH TAKING A DIFFERENT VIEW IN BABULAL VS. RAJVEER (RP 869/2021) HAS LAID DOWN THE CORRECT LAW ? B. IF REVENUE COURTS ARE COURTS, THEN WHETHER DESPITE NOT BEING A ADMINISTRATIVELY SUBORDINATE COURT TO THE HIGH COURT UNDER ARTICLE 235, THE REVENUE COURTS ARE JUDICIALLY SUBORDINATE TO THE HIGH COURT IN VIEW OF LAW LAID DOWN BY THE SUPREME COURT IN CASE OF S.K. SARKAR, MEMBER, BOARD OF REVENUE, LUCKNOW VS. VINAY CHANDRA REPORTED IN 1981 (1) SCC 436 ? C. IF YES, THEN WHETHER A PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA WILL LIE AGAINST THE ORDERS PASSED BY THE REVENUE COURTS IF IN VIEW OF THE 5 JUDGE SPECIAL BENCH JUDGEMENT OF THIS COURT IN THE CASE MANOJ KUMAR VS. BOARD OF REVENUE, REPORTED IN 2008 (1) MPLJ 152, LOOKING TO THE NATURE OF RELIEF SOUGHT FROM THE HIGH COURT, SUPERVISORY JURISDICTION OF THE HIGH COURT IS OTHERWISE INVOCABLE ? (IN THIS REGARD, KIND ATTN. IS INVITED ON ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER DTD.04-12-2024).</b> 01-ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION</small>

**Daily Cause List dated : 04-03-2025**

**BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI  
& HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VISHAL MISHRA**

3	<b>WP 14177/2024 (S)</b>	PRABHAKAR YEMDE	VIJAY KUMAR SHUKLA SUDARSHANA SHUKLA, SATYENDRA JYOTISHI
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH <b>&amp; Ors.</b>	ADVOCATE GENERAL ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-1][AG][R-2] [AG][R-3][AG] SERVICE RELATING TO STATE GOVT.-17100 - Retirement Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Pension SERVICE RELATING TO STATE GOVT.-17100 - Retirement Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Leave Encashment SERVICE RELATING TO STATE GOVT.-17100 - Retirement Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Gratuity Relief - TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS BE ORDERED TO GRANT THE BENEFIT {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>"WHETHER THE TEACHERS OF SCHOOLS RECEIVING GRANT-IN-AID UNDER THE UNAMENDED PROVISIONS OF M.P. ASHASHKIYA SHIKSHAN SANSTHAN (ADHYAPAKON TATHA ANYA KARMCHARIYON KE VETANO KE SANDAY) ADHINIYAM, 1978 WOULD UPON ABSORPTION IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE BE ENTITLED TO COUNTING OF PAST SERVICES FOR PURPOSE OF PENSION, IN VIEW OF RULE 2 (II) (D) OF M.P. CIVIL SERVICES PENSION RULES, 1976 AND RULE 10 OF ASHASHKIYA SHIKSHAN SANSTHAN (INSTITUTIONAL FUND) RULES, 1983?" AND IA NO.1740/2025-DOCUMENT TAKEN ON RECORD 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION</b>
3.1	<b>Linked WP 04660/2016 (S)</b>	RAMANAND SHUKLA <b>&amp; Ors.</b>	PUSHPENNDRA KUMAR VERMA ROHIT SOHGAURA, KAMLESH KUMAR VERMA, SHRI ALOK KUMAR GUPTA[P-2] [P-3][P-4][P-5][P-6][P-1], UPENDRA KU TRIPATHI[P-1]
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH <b>&amp; Ors.</b>	ADVOCATE GENERAL ABDUL TAUWWAN FARIDEE[R-1][AG] [R-2][AG][R-3][AG][R-4][AG][R-5][AG][R-6][AG][R-7][AG][R-8] [AG][R-9][AG] RESIDUARY MATTERS-19800 - RESIDUARY MATTERS-19800 - RESIDUARY MATTERS-19800 Relief - TO DIRECT THE RESPDT TO START DEDUCTION FROM THE SALARY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PENSION. {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>FOR ORDER LIST ALONG WITH WP NO. 11679/2021 [ADMITTED ON : 16-03-2022] 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION</b>
3.2	<b>Linked WP 20501/2016 (S)</b>	SHASHI KUMAR NIGAM	ALOK KUMAR GUPTA
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH <b>&amp; Ors.</b>	ADVOCATE GENERAL SAMI DAD KHAN[R-2][AG], HIMANSHU MISHRA[R-1][AG][R-3][AG][R-4][AG][R-5][AG] [R-6][AG] SERVICE RELATING TO STATE GOVT.-17100 - Retirement Benefit Cum Pension-17139 - Pension Relief - TO DIRECT THE RESP. TO DETERMINE AND PAY THE CLAIM REGARDING PENSION, GRATUITY, GPF AND OTHER SERVICE BENEFIT {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>FOR ORDER LIST ALONG WITH WP NO. 11679/2021 [ADMITTED ON : 16-03-2022] 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION</b>
3.3	<b>Linked WP 11679/2021 (S)</b>	ASHUTOSH MISHRA	ALOK KUMAR GUPTA SACHIN SHUKLA, UPENDRA KU TRIPATHI[P-1], VIVEK RANJAN PANDEY
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH <b>&amp; Ors.</b>	ADVOCATE GENERAL DARSHAN SONI[R-1][AG][R-2][AG] [R-3][AG][R-4][AG][R-5][AG][R-6][AG][R-7][AG][R-8][AG] SERVICE RELATING TO STATE GOVT.-17100 - Service Residuary-17143 - Service Residuary-17143 Relief - KINDLY BE DIRECT THE RES. TO FRAME THE SERVICE CONDITION / RULE AND MAKE APPROPRIATE PROVISION FOR NON TEACHING EMPLOYEE {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} <b>AS PER MENTION MEMO DT.13.02.2025 TO LIST ALONG WITH WP NO.14177/2024 AS IDENTICAL MATTER AND PETITIONER WISH TO ADDRESS THE HON'BLE FULL BENCH ON QUESTION OF LAW. [ADMITTED ON : 16-03-2022] 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION</b>

**TOTAL CASES : 7 (with connected matters)**

**PR (J) / R (J-I) / R(J-II)**