

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 6148 of 2016

1. Govind Prasad Sahu, S/o Shri Jagsai Sahu, aged about 34 years, presently working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School, Navagaon Block Masturi, District Bilaspur (CG).
2. Amit Kumar Yadav, S/o Shri Ramcharan Yadav, aged about 33 years, presently working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School, Gopiyapara Masturi, Block Masturi, District Bilaspur (CG).
3. Smt. Archana Rathore, W/o Shri Purshottam Singh Rathore, aged about 26 years, presently working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School, Jairamnagar Block Masturi, District Bilaspur (CG).
---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (CG).
2. Collector, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG).
3. District Panchayat, Bilaspur through its Chief Executive Officer, District Bilaspur (CG).
4. Janpad Panchayat, Masturi, through its Chief Executive Officer, District Bilaspur (CG).
5. Block Education Officer, Block Masturi, District Bilaspur (CG).

-----Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Sanjeev Kumar Sahu, Advocate
For State : Shri Aditya Sharma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

09/11/2016

1. The grievance ventilated through this petition is on account of non-consideration of petitioners' case for promotion on the next higher post of Teacher (Panchayat).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are in public employment with avenue of promotion provided under the Govt. recruitment rules known as Chhattisgarh Teacher (Panchayat) Cadre Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 2012. It is submitted that the petitioners have completed minimum eligibility of 7 years and large number of posts of Teacher (Panchayat) are lying vacant. The petitioners enjoy a very high position in the seniority list and are therefore within the zone of consideration. However, till date, respondents have not considered the case of the petitioners for promotion.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that this grievance can be ventilated by the petitioners invoking the remedy of statutory representation to the competent authority as provided under Rule 18 (1) (b) of the Panchayat Service (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1999 (for short “ the Rules of 1999 ”). A perusal of the aforesaid Rule clearly provides that a member of the Panchayat Service may make representation against an order which amongst others, denies promotion to a higher post or service to which is otherwise eligible according to recruitment rules and which is due to him in accordance to seniority.

4. This Court, in similar cases, has already disposed off the petition with a direction to consider representation in terms of statutory rules.

5. Accordingly, this petition is also disposed off with a direction that in case the petitioners prefer representation, the same shall be considered and decided by the authority by speaking order within a period of 6 months from the date of receipt of representation.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

L/-