

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 2659 of 2016

1. Chunnuram Sonwani S/o Shri Parsooram Sonwani, Aged About 43 Years Occupation Teacher Panchayat Varg- 02, Government Middle School Pendri Vikashkhand Jaijaipur R/o Gram Pendri Thana & Vikashkhand Jaijaipur Civil & Revenue District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
2. Narsingh Madhukar S/o Late Shri Samartan Madhukar Aged About 45 Years Occupation Teacher Panchayat Varg- 02 Governemnt Middle School Amoda Vikashkhand Jaijaipur R/o Gram Amoda Thana & Vikashkhand Jaijaipur Civil & Revenue District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
3. Tikeshwar Prasad Dube S/o Shri Dwarika Prasad Dube Aged About 50 Years Occupation Teacher Panchayat Varg- 02 Government Middle School Amoda Vikashkhand Jaijaipur R/o Gram Amoda Thana & Vikashkhand Jaijaipur Civil & Revenue District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Sachiv, Panchayat Avm Gramin Vikash Vibhag, Mantralay Naya Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Panchayat Directorate Chhattisgarh, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Mukhya Karyapalan Adhikari, District Panchayat Janjgir Champa, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
4. Mukhya Karyapalan Adhikari, Janpad Panchayat Jaijaipur, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
5. Collector, Janjgir Champa District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
6. District Education Officer, Janjgir Champa, District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Mr. Rajendra Kumar Patel, Advocate
For State : Mr. S.P. Kale, Dy. Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
Order On Board

26/07/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) since 2005, 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 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