

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5688 of 2016**

1. Vijay Kumar Thethwar, S/o. Late Shri R.K. Thethwar, aged about 47 years, Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. Higher Secondary School Kedar, Tahsil – Sarangarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)
2. Smt. Laxmi Pramanik, W/o Shri Shudha Nshu Pramanik, aged about 44 years, Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. Higher Secondary School Chhal Block & Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)
2. Smt. Premlata Sharma, W/o Shri Ajay Sharma, aged about 44 years, Lecturer (Panchayat), Govt. Higher Secondary School Chhal Block and Tahsil Dharamjaygarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through its Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Collector Raigarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)
3. District Education Officer, Raigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.)
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Sarangarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)
6. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh (C.G.)

--- Respondents

 For Petitioners : Shri R.S. Patel, Advocate.

For Respondents/State : Shri Garry Mukhopadhyaya, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order On Board

18/10/2016**Heard on admission.**

(1) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Lecturer (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.

(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/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)

Judge

D/-