

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.5996 of 2016**

1. Dondaram Shori S/o Shri Pandruram Shori, Aged About 44 Years Teacher Panchayat Verg 2, R/o Govt. U. Madhya. School Loobha, Village Loobha, Thana Makadi, Tah Makadi, District Kondagaon (Chhattisgarh)
2. Devnath Netam, S/o Late Shri Mangaluram Netam, Aged About 42 Years Occupation Teacher Panchayat Verg 2, R/o Govt. U. Madhyamik School, Randhna, Village Randhana, Thana Pharsgaon, Tah. Makadi, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Smt. Bharti Mishra, W/o Shri Onkar Nath Mishra, Aged About 44 Years Occupation Teacher Panchayat, Verg 2, Govt. U. Madhya. School, Makadi, R/o Village Makadi, Thana Makadi, Tah Makadi, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Peeluram Markam, S/o Shri Sukamanram, Aged About 56 Years Occupation Teacher Panchayat Verg 2 R/o Village Makadi, Thana Makadi, Tah. Makadi, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat, Gramin Vikas Avm Shram Vibhag, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Panchayat, Sanchalnalaya, Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat, Kondagaon, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Makadi, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Collector, Kondagaon, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh)
6. District Education Officer, Kondagaon, District Kondagaon, (Chhattisgarh).

--- Respondents

For Petitioners	: Shri Abdul Wahab Khan, Advocate
For State	: Shri Prasun Bhaduri, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

03/11/2016

- (1) Heard on admission.
- (2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are working as Teacher (Panchayat), 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 grievance. To this, counsel for the State has no objection.
- (3) Prayer appears to be fair and reasonable.
- (4) Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed off. In the eventuality of making any representation by the petitioners highlighting their grievance, the same is expected to be decided by the authority concerned expeditiously in accordance with law.
- (5) 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

L/-