

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.6192 of 2016**

1. Ashok Kumar Koshale S/o Sekhawa Ram Koshale, Aged About 44 Years Shiksha Karmi Class-1, (Chemistry)/ Lecturer, Block Palari, Baloda Bazar, Distt. Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Meena Thakur, D/o Madan Singh Thakur, Aged About 44 Years Lecturer In Guru Ghasi Das Government Higher Secondary School, Kasdol, Distt. Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Keshav Prasad Sahu, S/o G. P. Sahu, Aged About 46 Years Lecturer In Guru Ghasi Das Government Higher Secondary School, Kasdol, Distt. Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Visheram Mandaleshwar, S/o Puran Lal Mandaleshwar, Aged About 49 Years Shikshak Panchayat, Government Higher Secondary School, Lawan, Distt. Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat, Gramin Vikas Department, Mahanadi Mantralaya, New Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Sanchanalaya Chhattisgarh, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Distt. Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Baloda Bazar- Bhatapara, Distt. Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Collector, Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Distt. Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
6. District Education Officer, Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, Distt. Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	: Shri Sanjay Patel, Advocate
For State	: Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

11/11/2016

- (1) Heard on admission.
- (2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) since last many 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 grievance. 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 grievance, 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

L/-