

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 4634 of 2016

1. Shiv Prasad Paikra S/o Shri Pahari Ram, Aged About 50 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher Panchayat Govt. Primary School, Totako P.S. & Tahsil Odagi, Distirct Surajpur Chhattisgarh
2. Ramdev Paikra, S/o Shri Dhola Ram, Aged About 50 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher Panchayat Govt. Primary School Jaj P.S. & Tahsil Odagi, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh
3. Smt. Sandhya Choubey W/o Arun Kumar Choubey, Aged About 46 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant, Teacher Panchayat, Govt. Primary School Totako P.S. & Tahsil Odagi, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioners**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahandi Bhawan, New Raipur, Distirct Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Surajpur, Distirct Surajpur Chhattisgarh
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Odagi Distirct Surajpur Chhattisgarh
4. The Block Education Officer, Odagi, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

Shri A.N.Pandey, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

08/09/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) since 1998, 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 the 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