

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No.4493 of 2016

1. Vijay Kumar Yadav, S/o Shri Bahoran Ram Yadav, aged about 32 years, R/o Village Sawarawan, Govindgarh, Post Baijnathpur, P.S. Odgi, District Surajpur (C.G.)
  2. Dharampal Singh Gond, S/o Shri Nankuram Singh Gond, aged about 28 years, R/o Village Sawarawan, Patelpara, Post Baijnathpur, P.S. Odgi, District Surajpur (C.G.)
- Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Tribal Welfare Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur (C.G.)
  2. The Commissioner, Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Development, Raipur (C.G.)
  3. The Collector, District Surajpur (C.G.) (Tribal Development)
  4. The Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Surajpur, District Surajpur (C.G.)
  5. The Block Education Officer, Bhaiyathan, District Surajpur (C.G.)
- Respondents

---

For Petitioners: Mr. Atanu Ghosh, Advocate.  
For Respondents: Mrs. Astha Shukla, Panel Lawyer.

---

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

16/11/2016

1. This petition has been filed by the Part-Time Sweepers working in various schools in District Surajpur whose services have been discontinued in the year 2012.
2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the large number of similarly situated Part-Time Sweepers were discontinued from service and they had filed petitions before this

Court. All those petitions were disposed off by a common order dated 9-9-2015. It is submitted that the petitioners herein are identically situated as the petitioners in those petitions, because these petitioners were also Part-Time Sweepers appointed in various schools in the same district i.e. Surajpur and on similar consideration which weighed at the time of termination of the petitioners in above referred petitions, these petitioners were also discontinued from service.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Part-Time Sweepers are low rank of employees and very meagerly paid. Therefore, in these circumstances, this petition may be finally disposed off with a direction to the respondents to examine their individual cases and on parity, similar relief may be granted in cases of each of the petitioners.
4. In a batch of petitions filed by Part-Time Sweepers working in various schools in the same district where the petitioners were also working as Part-Time Sweepers, this Court had an occasion to examine the correctness of decision taken by the authority towards en-mass termination of Part-Time Sweepers. The reasons assigned for en-mass termination, as reflected in the case of Rameshwar Prasad Rajwar & others v. State of Chhattisgarh & others and batch of petitions, show that the appointments were illegally made by wrongly construing and interpreting direction of the State Govt.. This Court after hearing the parties, held as below:

“7. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties, it would appear that even if the respective

principals/head masters were not informed or authorized to make appointment, the fact remains that the State Government had earlier issued communications to the effect that there is no restriction for appointing part time sweepers. It has not been disputed by the respondents that the petitioners were in fact appointed by the respective principals/head masters prior to issuance of the order (Annexure-P-1) and the order (Annexure-P-7). Once the appointments have been made, even on part time basis, mass cancellation of appointments, without there being any specific individual allegation of corruption or nepotism is not permissible. At the same time, if any part time sweeper is not attending duties as he belongs to some other village or is otherwise not efficient in his work, it always remains open for the concerned head of the department or the appointing authority to initiate action, as the petitioners have no right to hold the post, being only part time sweepers.”

5. Prima facie, these petitioners also seem to be affected by the en mass termination while working in the same district and on similar consideration.
6. The petitioners, therefore, would also be entitled to similar benefits if their cases are similarly situated as the case of those petitioners who had earlier approached this Court and in whose favour, common order was passed on 9-9-2015.
7. In view of the above consideration, respondent Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Surajpur, shall individually examine the case of each of the petitioners and verify facts. If these petitioners are similarly situated as the petitioners in earlier batch of petitions, which was decided on 9-9-2015, the benefits which have accrued to those petitioners and as ordered by this Court earlier in the case of Rameshwar Prasad Rajwar (supra) shall also be granted to these petitioners.
8. Considering that the petitioners are very low-paid employees, the

Assistant Commissioner, Tribal Development, Surajpur, shall complete the exercise within a maximum period of 90 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

9. If the petitioners' grievances are not redressed/fully redressed, they will be at liberty to revive their petitions.
10. The petition stands finally disposed of in view of above terms. No order as to costs.

Sd/-  
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)  
Judge

Soma