

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**WPS No. 3245 of 2017**

Mamta Vaishnav W/o Nand Kishore Vaishnav, Aged About 32 Years  
Presently Posted And Working As Assistant Teacher (Panchayat), Primary  
School, Bagichapar (Birgaon) Block Mungeli, District Mungeli,  
Chhattisgarh

**---- Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office & Police Station Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office & Police Station Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Collector, Mungeli, District- Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
4. Zila Panchayat Mungeli, Through The Chief Executive Officer, Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Mungeli, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondents**

---

|                |   |                                                   |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : | Shri S.S. Baghel, Advocate                        |
| For State      | : | Shri A.S. Kachhawaha, Additional Advocate General |

---

**S.B.:Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**

**Order On Board**

**21/07/2017**

Heard on admission.

1. The grievance ventilated through this petition is on account of non-consideration of petitioner's case for promotion on the next higher post of Teacher (Panchayat).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in public

employment with avenue of promotion provided under the Govt. recruitment rules known as Chhattisgarh Teacher (Panchayat) Cadre (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 2012. It is submitted that the petitioner has completed minimum eligibility of 7 years and large number of posts of Teacher (Panchayat) are lying vacant. The petitioner enjoys a very high position in the seniority list and is, therefore, within the zone of consideration. However, till date, respondents have not considered the case of the petitioner for promotion.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that this grievance can be ventilated by the petitioner invoking the remedy of statutory representation to the competent authority as provided under Rule 18 (1) (b) of the Panchayat Service (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1999 (for short "*the Rules of 1999*"). A perusal of the aforesaid Rule clearly provides that a member of the Panchayat Service may make representation against an order which amongst others, denies promotion to a higher post or service to which is otherwise eligible according to recruitment rules and which is due to him in accordance to seniority.
4. This Court, in similar cases, has already disposed off the petition with a direction to consider representation in terms of statutory rules.
5. Accordingly, this petition is also disposed off with a direction that in case the petitioner prefers representation, the same shall be considered and decided by the authority by speaking order within a period of 6 months from the date of receipt of representation.

Sd/-  
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)  
Judge