

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPS No. 1894 of 2017**

- Yogesh Kumar Dhruw S/o Rupsingh Dhruw, Aged About 27 Years Working As Assistant Teacher ( Panchayat ) At Govt. Primary School Ghotiyapani, Block Bagbahara, District Mahasamund (Chhattisgarh).

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

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayat Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya New Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Panchayat Mahasamund, District Mahasamund (Chhattisgarh).
3. Chief Executive Officer. Janpad Panchayat Bagbahara, District Mahasamund (Chhattisgarh).

**---- Respondent**


---

For Petitioner : Shri Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate.  
 For Respondent/State : Shri Satish Gupta, Govt. Advocate.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra****Order On Board****27/04/2017**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner is a member of Panchayat Service, therefore, statutory representation is provided under Rule 18(1)(b) of the Panchayat Service (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1999 (henceforth 'the Rules, 1999'). It is contended that since the matter relates to promotion, therefore, the petitioner may be given liberty to move representation before the appropriate authority so that the

statutory remedy, which is available to the petitioner may be exhausted.

2. The relevant Rule 18(1)(b) of the Rules, 1999 as referred is quoted hereunder:-

**“18. Representation on other cases.** - (1) A member of the Panchayat Service may make representation against an order which.-

(a) xxxxxxxxx

(b) denies promotion to a higher post or service to which is other wise eligible according to the recruitment rules and which is due to him according to seniority; or”.

3. After going through the facts, it is directed that in case the petitioner makes a suitable application as per Rule 18 (1)(b) of the Rules, 1999 along with application for condonation of delay, if so advised and places his grievances along with all the documents, in such cases, the prescribed authority may decide the same within further period of three months on the facts available before it.
4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities may decide the representation on its own merits.
5. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-  
**Judge**  
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)