2-0 (1)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)
Writ Petition (S) No. 221 of 2015

PETITIONERS :1. Smt. Jamuna Khilare wife of Shri Ramdas Khilare, aged about 46 years, working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Government Primary School, Hardi, Police Station & Block-Khairagarh, District-Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

wp(S) 221/15
T.O.Ker 1566/15
Received by Mr. G. Khatri
21/1/15

2. Suresh Kumar Verma son of Shri Hemulal Verma, aged about 43 years, working as Teacher (Panchayat), Government Middle School, Surajpura (Jungle), Police Station & Block-Sahaspur-Lohara, District-Kabirdham (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Panchayat and Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

Oath Commissioner S. R. Kaushik Bilaspur (C.G.)

2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Rajnandgaon, District- Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

3. The Block Education Officer, Khairagarh, District-Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

4. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Khairagarh, District- Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

5. The Block Education Officer, Sahaspur-Lohara, District-Kabirdham (C.G.)

6. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Sahaspur-

Lohara, District- Kabirdham (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(22)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SB: Hon'ble Shri Justice Pritinker Diwaker

Writ Petition (S) No. 221 of 2015

PETITIONERS Smt. Jamuna Khilare and another

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS State of Chhattisgarh and Others

Shri Goutam Khetrapal, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Rahul Tamaskar, P.L. for the State.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

ORDER
(27.01.2015)

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the matter is heard finally.

According to the petitioners, though they are entitled to time-scale promotion after completion of 10 years of service, till date the same has not been granted to them despite issuance of the circular dated 02.11.2011 by the State Government.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that purpose of filing this writ petition would be served if at this stage the petitioners are permitted to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to file a representation before the Chief Executive Officer (Respondent No.4) in terms of Annexure-P/2 and the said authority is directed to decide the same.

Counsel for the State submits that he has no objection if the request of counsel for the petitioner is acceded to.

In the aforesaid view of the matter, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty. In the eventuality of the petitioners filing a representation before Respondent No.4 detailing their grievances therein along with a copy of this order and writ petition, within one month from today, Respondent No.4 is expected to decide the same strictly in accordance with law considering the eligibility and entitlement of the petitioners, within a further period of four months thereafter .

23

It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation on the merits of the case and Respondent No.4 would be at liberty to pass the order strictly in accordance with law.

Sd/-
Pritinker Diwakar
Judge

subbu