

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2818 of 2015

- Narendra Kumar Verma S/o Shri Tilak Ram Verma, Aged About 48 years Working As Head Master, Govt. Middle School, Newari, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh S/o Through Secretary, Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- Director, Public Instructions, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- Deputy Director, Public Instructions, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
- District Education Officer, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

And

WPS No. 2822 Of 2015

- Kamleshwar Prasad Rai S/o Late Sukhdev Prasad, Aged About 51 years Working As Head Master, Govt. Middle School, Mohra, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Vs

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- Director, Public Instructions, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- Deputy Director, Public Instructions, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- District Education Officer, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Petitioners
For Respondent/State

Shri C.J. K. Rao, Advocate
Shri Sangharsh Pandey, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board By

05/08/2015

1. The petitioners are working as Head Master, they are aggrieved by their supersession in the matter of promotion to the post of Lecturer (Hindi).
2. According to learned counsel for the petitioners, number of juniors have been promoted and despite representation being filed by the petitioners, their grievance has not been paid heed to. He would submit that the petitioners have not earned any adverse remark, nor any enquiry is pending against them, therefore, non-consideration of their case for promotion is arbitrary.
3. Learned counsel would further submit that for the present, the petitioners may be permitted to make fresh representation and the respondents be directed to decide the same at the earliest, so that the petitioners are aware as to the reason for denial of promotion.
4. Learned State counsel would submit that if fresh representation is filed, the same shall be considered and decided, in accordance with law.
5. In view of the foregoing, the writ petitions are disposed of with a direction that in the event, the petitioners submit fresh representation within a period of one month from today, the competent authority shall

consider and decide the same by a speaking order, in accordance with law, on its own merits, within a further period of three months.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the matter, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order, as opinion on the merits of the case.

Sd/-

JUDGE

PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA