

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 7507 of 2018**

Vinod Kumar S/o Jaga Mahato, Aged About 47 Years, R/o
Tambeshwar Nagar, Post Aragahi, Block Ramchandrapur, District
Balrampur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, School Education Department, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Collector, Ambikapur, District Ambikapur Chhattisgarh
4. Collector Balrampur, District Balrampur- Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Prem Nagar, District Surguja Chhattisgarh
6. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Ramchandrapur, District Balrampur- Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh
7. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Udaipur, District Surguja Chhattisgarh
8. The Superintendent Of Police, Anti-corruption Bureau, Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Basant Kaiwartya, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Majid Ali, Dy. Govt. Advocate

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

15/11/2018

1. Grievance of the petitioner is that he was appointed as Shiksha Karmi vide Annexure P/1 (filed collectively) along with number of other persons.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after about 2 years of service, the petitioner's service was terminated by an oral order along with other persons. Some of the persons filed writ petition before this Court and thereafter, their representations were considered and they have been given appointment vide order dated 20.9.2013, 8.10.2015, 13.07.2017 and 21.02.2018 (Annexure P-4). He submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if at this stage the petitioner is permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty to file representation before respondent No. 3 for similar relief. However, he prays for direction to respondent No. 3 to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of order dated 20.9.2013 passed in favour of five other similarly situated persons. He further submits that some time limit may also be fixed for respondent No. 3 to pass order.
3. State counsel has no objection if any such direction is issued to respondent No. 3. He, however, submits that the petitioner's case would be considered strictly in accordance with law subject to his suitability.
4. In view of above, the petitioner is permitted to withdraw this petition with the aforesaid liberty. In the eventuality of filing fresh representation along with copy of this order by the petitioner before respondent No. 3 within three weeks from today, it is expected from respondent No. 3 to pass appropriate order in accordance with law keeping in view the order dated 20.9.2013, 08.10.2015, 13.07.2017 and 21.02.2018 (Annexure P/4) as expeditiously as possible preferably within four months from the date of receipt of such representation.

5. Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the competent authority shall be at liberty to decide representation of the petitioner in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Khatai