

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPS No. 4555 of 2016**

- Satish Kumar Kashyap S/o Mohitram Kashyap, Aged About 31 Years Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Govt. Boys Primary School, Saida, Block Takhatpur, District- Bilaspur, Civil And Revenue District- Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Secretary, Panchayat & Rural Development, Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur Chhattisgarh, Pin- 492001
2. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Takhatpur, District- Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. Block Education Officer, Takhatpur, District- Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

**---- Respondents**


---

For Petitioner: Mr. Dheerendra Pandey, Advocate  
 For State : Mr. Shashank Thakur, Government Advocate

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy****Order on Board****06.03.2017**

1. The grievance of the Petitioner is that inspite of the Petitioner working with the Respondent No.2 since October, 2007 his services have not been regularized.
2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that as early as in the year 2010 itself the case of the Petitioner was recommended for regularization along with a large number of the similarly placed Shiksha Karmis. He submits that from the same list a large number of people have already been regularized but for some reason the

case of the Petitioner has not been considered or processed by the Respondents.

3. At this juncture he submits that the present Writ Petition was filed on 31.08.2016 and the Petition was also admitted immediately. The notices were also issued to the Respondents as early as on 14.09.2016 but till date no reply has been filed. He submits that instead of keeping the Writ Petition pending the Petition itself may be disposed off with a direction to the Respondent No.2 to take decision in the case of the Petitioner as to whether he is entitled for regularization or not. In case if he is entitled for the same, he may be regularised immediately and if he is not entitled he may be intimated as to why he is not entitled for being regularised.
4. Learned State Counsel does not have objection to this proposal, of issuing a direction to Respondent No.2. According to the State Counsel the Respondent No.2 is the authority who has to take a decision on the claim of the Petitioner.
5. In view of the same the present Writ Petition stands disposed with a direction to the Petitioner that he shall along with a copy of the order passed in the present Writ Petition submit a detailed representation to Respondent No.2 afresh, who in turn shall take a decision whether the Petitioner is entitled for the regularization in service as has been done in the case of other similarly placed

persons on the basis of the recommendation dated 11.06.2010 in which the name of the Petitioner is also reflected. Let the decision in this regard be taken within a period of 90 days from the date the Petitioner presents a certified copy of this order along with fresh representation.

6. With the aforesaid observation the present Writ Petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)  
**JUDGE**