

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 356 of 2016**

- Santosh Kumar Sonwani, S/o Shri Babulal Sonwani, aged about 30 years, presently posted as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), at Primary School Taulipali, R/o Kartala Tahsil & P.S. Kartala, District Korba (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through its Secretary Panchayat and Rural Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi, Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Korba, District – Korba (C.G.)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)
4. Block Education Officer, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate.

For Respondents : Shri S.P. Kale, Dy. A. G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board**03/02/2016**

(1) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was initially appointed as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) vide order dated 15.11.2007 issued

by Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Korba and thereafter, after two years his services was terminated by CEO, Janpad Panchayat, Korba vide order dated 17.08.2009. The petitioner preferred appeal thereagainst before the Collector, Korba. The Collector Korba, by order dated 21.10.2012 set aside the order of CEO, Janpad Panchayat, Korba, along with consequential benefits and pursuant to which, he has been reinstated in service by CEO, Janpad Panchayat, Korba but thereafter despite his representation dated 13.08.2015, benefit of regularization & other consequential benefits has not been extended by CEO, Janpad Panchayat, Korba, and, therefore, he may be permitted to file fresh representation to the CEO, Janpad Panchayat, Korba for redressal of his grievances and the same may be directed to be decided within the specific time frame

(2) Prayer appears to be fair & reasonable.

(3) Be that as it may, if the petitioner prefers fresh representation to the CEO, Janpad Panchayat, Korba for redressal of his grievances within a period of two weeks from today, it is directed to be decided by the authority concerned within a further period of two months from the date of receipt thereof.

(4) With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands finally disposed of.

(5) It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the authority concerned is free to decide the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law on its own merit.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-