

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No.5556 of 2016

1. Harsh Ram Choudhary S/o Natho Ram Choudhary, Aged About 43 Years
Occupation Asst. Teacher Panchayat, Government Primary School Madanpur,
Block Dharamajigarh, Tahsil And Janpad Panchayat Dharamjaigarh, Civil And
Revenue Distirct Raigarh Chhattisgarh
2. Bharosh Ram Patel S/o Shri Madhusudan Patel, Aged About 47 Years
Occupation Asst. Teacher Panchayat, Government Primary School Paraghati,
Block Dharamajigarh, Tahsil And Janpad Panchayat Dharamjaigarh, Civil And
Revenue Distirct Raigarh Chhattisgarh
3. Ganpat Singh Kshatriya, S/o Late Shambhu Singh Kshatriya, Aged About 47
Years Occupation Asst. Teacher Panchayat, Government Primary School
Rajkot, Village Rajkot, Block Dharamajigarh, Tahsil And Janpad Panchayat
Dharamjaigarh, Civil And Revenue Distirct Raigarh Chhattisgarh
4. Dharam Sai Rathia S/o Shri Baiga Ram Rathia, Aged About 42 Years
Occupation Asst. Teacher Panchayat, Government Primary School
Dhondhagaon, Tahsil And Janpad Panchayat Dharamjaigarh, Civil And
Revenue Distirct Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And
Rural Development, New Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan New Raipur,
Chhattisgarh
2. The Collector, Distirct Raigarh Chhattisgarh
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Raigarh, Distirct Raigarh
Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Dharamjaigarh, Distirct Raigarh
Chhattisgarh
5. The District Education Officer, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Vivek Bhakta, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri S. P. Kale, Dy.AG

S.B. : Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

06/10/2016

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.

2. To this, learned counsel for the State has no objection.

3. Prayer appears to be fair and reasonable.

4. 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.

5. 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