

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2143 of 2016**

- Kosaram Mandavi S/o Shri Hidamba Mandavi, Aged About 35 Years Occupation Assistant Teacher Panchayat Balak Ashram Shala Surnar R/o Village Surnar Vikashkhand And Thana Katekalyan, Civil & Revenue District Dantewada Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Sachiv, Chhattisgarh Madhyamik Shiksha Mandal Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Principal, Incharge Study Centre Durast Shiksha Karyakaram, Karyalaya Pracharya Shaskaiya Kanya U.M.V. Katekalyan Vikaskhand Katekalyan District Dantewada Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

And**WPC No. 2155 Of 2016**

- Mankuram Mandavi S/o Shri Kummaram Mandavi, Aged About 35 Years Occupation Assistant Teacher, Primary School Chindgufa, Bhusaras R/o Village Chindgufa, Block Katekalyan, Thana Gadiras, Revenue & Civil District Dantewada Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. Sachiv, Chhattisgarh Madhyamik Shiksha Mandal Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Principal, Study Centre Incharge, Durasth Shiksha Karyakram, Office Of Principal, Government Girls Higher Secondary School, Katekalyan, Block Katekalyan, Distt Dantewada Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

And**WPC No. 2232 Of 2016**

- Santosh Kumar Thakur S/o Shri Girdhar Lal Aged About 37 Years Occupation, Assistant Teacher Panchayat, Shashkiya Kanya Aashram Badebedma, R/o Gram Badebedma Block Katekalyan, Thana Nakulnar Revenue & Civil District Dantewada (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. Sachiv, Chhattisgarh Madhyamik Shiksha Mandal Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Principal/ Adhyayan Kendra Prabhari Durashth Shiksha Karyakram
Karyalay Principal Government Higher Secondary School Katekalyan Block
Katekalyan District Dantewada (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioners	:	Shri Rajendra Patel, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****03/03/2017**

1. Shri Manoj Paranjpe, learned counsel for the respondent Chhattisgarh Madhyamik Shiksha Mandal Raipur would submit that the corrected mark-sheets of D.Ed. have been issued in favour of the petitioners.
2. The said statement is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners.
3. In view of the statement made, all the writ petitions have been rendered infructuous. Accordingly, the writ petitions are dismissed as having become infructuous.

Sd/-

Judge

Prashant Kumar Mishra

Ashu