

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**W.P.(C) No. 839 of 2012**

1. Ajay Mandavi, S/o. Ram Mandavi, "Sarpanch" Gram Panchayat- Chinori, Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
2. Tulsi Ram Sinha, S/o. Shankerlal Sinha, "Sachiv" Gram Panchayat- Chinori, Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
3. Kanhaiya Sahu, S/o. Shivilal Sahu, "Gram Rozgar Sahayak" Gram Panchayat- Chinori, Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
4. Shrimati Geeta Mandavi, W/o. Ajay Mandavi, "Ex Sarpanch" Gram Panchayat- Chinori, Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
5. Anand Nagaraj, S/o. Radheylal Nagaraj, "Ex-Sachiv" Gram Panchayat- Chinori, Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
6. Mukesh Sinha, S/o. Fagnuram Sinha, "Ex Gram Rozgar Sayak" Gram Panchayat- Chinori, Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.).
2. The Lokpal Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, Kanker, District Kanker.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Janpadd Panchayat Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
4. Sampat Sinha, S/o. Ishwar Sinha, R/o. Village Chinori, Post Lakhanpuri, Tahsil Charama Distt. Kanker (C.G.).
5. Deepak Kunjam, S/o. Tulsiram Kunjam, R/o. Village Chinori, Post Lakhanpuri, Tahsil Charama, Distt. Kanker (C.G.).

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Shobhit Koshta, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****18.04.2019**

Heard.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the parties would submit that the issue involved in this writ petition is squarely covered by the decision of this Court passed in WPC No.1032 of 2012 (*Shrimati Jaimila Markam and others v.*

State of Chhattisgarh and others) decided on 1st May, 2013 in which in para 6 and 7 it has been held as under:-

“6. In the event, review petitions are filed within a period of two weeks, no action shall be taken pursuant to the impugned order and the same shall not be given effect to, till final order is passed in review, in accordance with law.

7. This order is passed in the facts of the present cases. However, review in general may be maintainable only on the grounds stated in the memo dated 01.11.2012.”

2. Accepting the statement made by learned counsel for the parties, the instant writ petition is disposed of in terms of para 6 and 7 of the order passed in **Shrimati Jaimila Markam** (supra). No cost(s).

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge