

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.444 of 2017**

1. Ku. Manisha Dubey D/o Laxmichand Dubey, Aged About 41 Years Working As Shiksha Karmi Grade III And Posted At Gurughasidas Govt. Higher Secondary School Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Ku. Laxmi Sai, D/o Babulal Sai, Aged About 37 Years Working As Shiksha Karmi Grade III And Posted At Govt. Navin Primary School Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chaman Lal Patel, S/o Kanhaiyalal Patel, Aged About 46 Years Working As Shiksha Karmi Grade II And Posted At Gurughasidas Govt. Higher Secondary School Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat, Gramin Vikas, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Sanchalnalaya, Chhattisgarh Indrawati Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Collector, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)
6. District Education Officer, Baloda Bazar, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	: Shri S.K. Guha, Advocate
For State	: Shri Prasun Bhaduri, Dy.G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

27/01/2017

(1) Heard on admission.

(2) 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 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/-