

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 5444 of 2016

1. Harkeshwar Paikra S/o Shri Chandraman Paikra, Aged About 44 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher Panchayat Govt. High School Pakani, Block Odagi, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh
2. Katwari Ram Paikra S/o Shri Nawal Sai Paikra, Aged About 45 Years Presently Wroking On The Post Of Assistant Teacher Panchayat Govt. Primary School Raisari Block Odagi District Surajpur Chhattisgarh
3. Ghanshyam Agrawal S/o Late Goverdhan Agrawal, Aged About 43 Years Presently Working On The Post Of Assistant Teacher Panchayat Govt. Primary School Thakurpara Pakani, Block Odagi, District Surajpur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

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

---- Respondents

Shri A.N.Pandey, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri D.R.Minj, Dy.G.A. for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

04/10/2016

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