NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 4679 of 2016

1. Smt. Minal Singh W/o Shri Santosh Singh, Aged About 38 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) Govt. Primary School, Kanya Asharam Jatro, Block Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

2. Anil Kumar Toppo, S/o Shri Pryag Toppo, Aged About 36 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School, Banor (Kamp) Block Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

3. Ku. Meena Bada, D/o Shri Lorence Bada, Aged About 33 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School, Dhorhikona, Block Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

4. Mamta Rani Kujur, D/o Shri Hermen Kujur, Aged About 33 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) Govt. Primary School, Raksadadar, Block Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

3. The Chief Executive Officer , Janpad Panchayat Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

4. The Block Education Officer, Balrampur, Distt. Balrampur- Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Mr. A.N. Pandey, Advocate.
For State : Mr. R.K. Gupta, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

09/09/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) since 2005, neither they have been given *Kramonnati* nor they have been given *Samayman Vetanman* (time bound pay scale) and therefore, they may be permitted to file representation before the competent authority for redressal of their grievances. To this, counsel for the State has no objection.

2. Prayer appears to be fair and reasonable.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed off. In the eventuality of making any representation by the petitioners highlighting their grievances, the same is expected to be decided by the authority concerned expeditiously in accordance with law.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on merits of the case and authority concerned would be at liberty to decide the representation in accordance with law.

Sd/-

(**Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)**
J U D G E

Rekha