

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPS No. 285 of 2016**

1. Baldeo Das, S/o Shri Manglu Das, aged about 41 years, R/o Village Manpur, Tahsil Wadrafnagar, P.S. Raghunathnagar, District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.)
2. Ram Kumar Yadav, S/o Laxmi Narayan Yadav, aged 52 years, R/o Virendranagar, P.S. Virendranagar Tehsil, Wadrafnagar, District Balrampur- Ramanujganj (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: The Secretary, Department of Panchayat & Rural Development, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The District Collector, The Collector's Office Ambikapur
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Wadraf Nagar, Distt. Surguja (C.G.)
4. The Superintendent of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, Bilaspur (C.G.)
5. Pahluram Kushwaha, S/o Dashram, aged about 24 years, R/o Village Sarna (Nouli), Post-Raghunath Nagar, Distt. Surguja (C.G.)
6. Harishchand Prasad Gautam, S/o Shri Ram Prasad, aged about 41 years, R/o Raghunathnagar, Tahsil Wadrafnagar, P.S. Raghunathnagar, District Balrampur – Ramnujganj (C.G.)
7. Lal Bahadur, S/o Late Munnalal, aged about 37 years, R/o Village Sarna, P.S. Raghunathnagar, Tahsil Wardranagar, District Balrampur – Ramanujgaj (C.G.)
8. Tarkeshwar Yadav, S/o Ram Vilas, aged about 43 years, R/o village Rampur, P.S. Chalgali, District Balrampur – Ramanujganj (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri Shakti Raj Sinha, Advocate.
For Respondents	: Shri Y.S. Thakur, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

28/01/2016

(1) Grievance of the petitioners is that they were appointed as Shikshakarmi vide Annexure P/1 (filed collectively) along with number of other persons including those whose names find place in the document Annexure P/4.

(2) Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that after about 1½ years of service, the petitioners' services were terminated by an oral order along with other persons. Some of the persons filed writ petition before this Court and thereafter, their representations were considered and they have been given appointment vide order dated 20.9.2013 & 8.10.2015 (Annexure P-4). He submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if at this stage the petitioners are permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to file representation before respondent No. 3 for similar relief. However, he prays for direction to respondent No. 3 to consider the case of the petitioners in the light of order dated 20.9.2013 passed in favour of five other similarly situated persons. He further submits that some time limit may also be fixed for respondent No. 3 to pass order.

(3) State counsel has no objection if any such direction is issued to respondent No. 3. He, however, submits that the petitioners' case would be considered strictly in accordance with law subject to their suitability.

(4) In view of above, the petitioners are permitted to withdraw this petition with the aforesaid liberty. In the eventuality of filing fresh representation along with copy of this order by the petitioners before respondent No. 3 within three weeks from today, it is expected from respondent No. 3 to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law keeping in view the order dated 20.9.2013 & 8.10.2015 (Annexure P/4) as expeditiously as possible preferably within four months from the date of receipt of such representation.

(5) Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the competent authority shall be at liberty to decide representation of the petitioners in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge**

D/-