

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 4909 of 2016

1. Kartik Ram Dansena S/o Late Shri Ghasiram Dansena Aged About 51 Years Occupation, Assistant Teacher Panchayat, Primary School Uparsalkheta Sankul- Bairagi R/o Gram Uparsalkheta Thana Kapu Tah. Dharamjaigarh Revenue & Civil District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
2. Sajjanram Nag Late Tiluram Nag Aged About 30 Years Occupation Assistant Teacher Panchayat, Govt. Primary School, Gotes hilar Sankul- Sonpur R/o Gram Gotes hilar Thana Kapu Tah. Dharamjaigarh, Revenue & Civil District Raigarh, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat, Gramin Vikash Vibhag, Mantralay Naya Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Panchayat Sanchalnalay Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan, Naya Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
5. Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh).
6. District Education Officer, Raigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh).
7. Block Education Officer, Dharamjaigarh Block Dharamjaigarh District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

Mr. Abdul Wahab Khan, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Mr. Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy. G.A. for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

20/09/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) since last 10 years, 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