

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 5470 of 2016

1. Smt. Sangeeta Minj W/o. Shri Juvela Minz, Aged About 44 Years Lecturer, Govt. Higher Secondary School Chhind, Tahsil Sarangarh Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
2. Ramesh Lal Bharti S/o Shri Ghunaru Ram, Aged About 45 Years Lecturer, Govt. Higher Secondary School Hardi Tahsil Sarangarh Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
3. Smt. Rajkumari Mahendra W/o Shri S. R. Mahendra, Aged About 38 Years Lecturer, (Govt. Girls Higher Secondary School) Govt. Mumtpurpose Higher Secondary School Sarangarh Block & Tahsil Sarangarh Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
4. Smt. Kamini Dansena, W/o Shri Chunamani Dansena, Aged About 44 Years Lecturer, Govt. Higher Secondary School Dansara Block & Tahsil Sarangarh Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
5. Suresh Singh Chouhan S/o Shri Sureet Ram Chouhan Aged About 45 Years Lecturer, Govt. Higher Secondary School Farswani Block & Tahsil Sarangarh Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
6. Gajendra Kumar Chouhan S/o Late Shri Natthu Lal Chouhan Aged About 45 Years Lecturer, Govt. Higher Secondary School Malda (B) Block & Tahsil Sarangarh Dist. Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, School Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh).
3. District Education Officer, Raigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh).
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Sarangarh, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri R.S. Patel, Advocate
For State	:	Shri D.R. Minj, Dy. Govt. Advocate

S.B.: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 though the petitioners are working as Shiksha Karmi Grade- 1/Lecturer (Panchayat) since 2005, neither they have been given Kramonnati nor Samayman Vetanman (time bound pay scale) and, therefore, the petitioners 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 merits of the case and authority concerned would be at liberty to decide the representation in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge