

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 4694 of 2016

1. Smt. Shanti Bhagat W/o Shri Ajay Kumar, Aged About 44 Years
Occupation Service, Working As Shiksha Karmi Grade II Presently
Working As Government Middle School Talgaon, Tahsil
Dharamjaigarh, Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District Raigarh
Chhattisgarh
2. Rukman Chainey W/o Shri Pramod Mishra, Aged About 43 Years
(After Marriage Smt. Rukmani Mishra) Occupation Service Working
As Shiksha Karmi Grade III Presently Working At Government
Primary School Maharajganj Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigh
Raigarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of
Panchayat And Rural Development Of Panchayat And Rural
Development Ne Mantralaya, Mahandi Bhawan, New Raipur
Chhattisgarh
2. The Collector, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Raigarh, District
Raigarh Chhattisgarh
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Dharamjaigarh,
Distirct Raigarh Chhattisgarh
5. The District Education Officer, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Vivek Bhakta, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. S.P. Kale, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

14/09/2016

Heard on admission.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that

though the petitioners are working as Shiksha Karmi Grade-II and Shiksha Karmi Grade-III since 1998, 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)
J U D G E