

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 6253 of 2016

1. Smt. Gayatri Jaiswal W/o. Shri K. P. Jaiswal, Aged About 50 Years Presently Working as Assistance Teacher Govt. Primary School Pantora, P. S. & Block Baloda, Revenue & Civil District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
2. Smt. Lachhan Bai Khairwar, W/o Shri Ram Swaroop Khairwar, Aged About 50 Years Posted As Assistance Teacher (Panchayat) At Janpad Prathmik- Shala- Kendara, P. S. & Block Baloda, Revenue & Civil District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
3. Navratan Singh Kanwar S/o Shri Mohan Singh, Aged About 43 Years Presently Working As Assistance Teacher, Govt. Primary School Handaspur, P. S. & Block Baloda, Revenue & Civil District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
4. Mahesh Dev Singh S/o Gaukaran Singh, Aged About 51 Years Presently Working As Assistant Teacher (Panchayat) Govt. Primary School Pantora P. S. & Block Baloda, Revenue & Civil District Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Janjgir Champa, Distt. Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Baloda Distt. Janjgir Champa (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Block Education Officer, Baloda Distt. (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioners	:	Shri Sandeep Dubey, Advocate.
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Dhiraj Kumar Wankhede, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

16/11/2016

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. To which, 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/-