

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5873 of 2016**

1. Dayaram Shori, son of Shri Lachhura Shori, aged about 31 years, Occupation Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School, Maaripara Themgaon, resident of Village Maaripara, Themgaon, Block & Police Station Makdi, District Kondagaon (C.G.)
2. Mangalram Netam, son of Shri Sadhura Netam Shori, aged about 51 years, Occupation Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Primary School Nayapara, Kosahardulee, resident of Village Nayapara, Kosahardulli, Block & Police Station Makdi, Distt. Kondagaon (C.G.)
3. Madhoram Markam, son of Shri Malsai Markam, aged 31 years, occupation Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. High School, Balod, resident of Village Balod, Block & Police Station Makdi, District Kondagaon (C.G.)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh through :-

1. Through the Secretary, Panchayat Gramin Vikas Vibhag, Mantralaya, New Raipur (C.G.)
2. Director, Panchayat Directorate, Chhattisgarh, Indrawati Bhawan, New Raipur (C.G.)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Kondagaon, Distt. Kondagaon (C.G.)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Makdi, District Kondagaon (C.G.)
5. Collector, Kondagaon, Distt. Kondagaon (C.G.)
6. District Education Officer, Kondagaon, District Kondagaon (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Abdul Wahab Khan, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Mrs. Astha Shukla, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board**25/10/2016**

Heard on admission.

(1) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) since last many years, 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. This this, counsel for the State has no objection.

(2) Prayer appears to 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/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-