

(1) (b)

**IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT
BILASPUR**

W.P. (S) No. 309 /2014 2015

PETITIONERS

- WP(S) 309/15
19/11/15
Presented by Mr. Rajendra B. Dubey
28/11/15*
- PETITIONERS** :- 1. Vijay Kumar Dubey S/o Shri Shyam Bihari Dubey, aged about 45 years, R/o B.T.I. Road, House No. 216, Police Station Mahasamund, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund (C.G), Lecturer Government Middle School, Mahasamund (C.G.)
2. Hemendra Acharya S/o Shri Yogeshwar Acharya, aged about 51 years, R/o Ayodhya Nagar, Police Station Mahasamund, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund (C.G), Lecturer, Government Higher Secondary School Mahasamund (CG)
3. R.K. Patel S/o Late S.P. Patel, aged about 51 years, R/o village-Kodmarra, Post Tolda, Via- Basna, Police Station Mahasamund, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund (C.G.), Lecturer D.I.E.T. Mahasamund (C.G.)
4. Rajesh Chandrakar, S/o Gokul Chandrakar, aged about 48 years, R/o Near Shyam Vidyamandir, Milibhata, Police Station Mahasamund, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund (C.G), Lecturer in Government Higher Secondary School, Nandgaon, Mahasamund (C.G.).
5. Shrikant Mishra S/o Y.L. Mishra, aged about 54 years, Teacher Government Higher Secondary School, Mahasamund R/o Ramantola, Police Station Mahasamund, Civil & Revenue District Mahasamund (C.G).
- Br*



VERSUS

- RESPONDENTS** :-
1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.).
 2. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Chief Secretary, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

1)

2

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Writ Petition (S) No. 309 of 2015

Petitioners

Vijay Kumar Dubey and others

VERSUS

Respondents

State of Chhattisgarh and another

Present: Shri Rahul Birtharey, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Vaibhav A. Goverdhan, PL for the State.

Oral Order
(30.01.2015)

The instant petition has been filed with a limited prayer of a writ in the nature of mandamus to be issued to the respondents to decide the representation which the petitioners have preferred.

2. The grievance of the petitioners is that the petitioners who are the Govt. Teachers, had made a representation to the State Government for considering their case for promotion to the higher post in accordance with the judgment rendered in the matter of **Suraj Bhan Meena and Another vs. State of Rajasthan and Others** reported in (2011) 1 Supreme Court Cases 467.

3. State counsel, without entering into the merits, submits that so far as the prayer for deciding the representation of the petitioners is concerned, the State does not have any objection.

4. In the light of the submissions made by counsel for the parties, the writ petition stands disposed of with a direction to the State Government to consider the representation moved by the petitioners in accordance to its merits as expeditiously as possible.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge