

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 6066 of 2008**

Smt. Damyanti Goutam, W/o Shri Premchandra Goutam Aged 39 years,
 Caste : Scheduled Caste, Upper Division Teacher, Resident of Muktipara,
 Fundudihri Ward No. 2, Thana & Tahsil, Ambikapur, District Surguja, C.G.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Public Education Directorate,
Raipur CG
2. Commissioner Public Education Directorate, Raipur C.G.
3. Director, Public Education Directorate, Raipur C.G.
4. Deputy Director Education Surajpur, District.-Sarguja C.G.
5. District Education Officer Surajpur, District-Sarguja C.G.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	None
For State	:	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****05/07/2019**

1. The relief sought for by the petitioner in the present writ petition primarily is for directing the respondents to decide the representation Annexure P-4 which the petitioner has made and the petitioner has also sought for the correction of the seniority list as also putting the name of petitioner in the Gradation list of Upper Division Teacher so that the petitioner becomes eligible to the post of Lecturer.
2. The respondents filed their reply and in their reply they have categorically mentioned that the petitioner is not eligible for the promotion for the reason that petitioner was promoted as Upper Division Teacher only on 31.03.2005 and since then she does not

have requisite seniority for being put in the zone of consideration for promotion to the post of Lecturer under the category to which the petitioner belongs. The respondents in their reply to paragraph 8.3 has submitted that out of these four posts, available for promotion in the Scheduled Caste category, the candidates whose name was at serial No. 78, 123, 125 & 126 were found eligible for promotion by the DPC. The name of petitioner stood at serial No. 128 in all probability, pending the writ petition before this Court, the petitioner must have got promotion on the post of Lecturer, that could be the reason there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

3. If the grievance of the petitioner has not been redressed or the grievance of the petitioner still survives, this Court is of the opinion, let the petitioner make a fresh representation to the authorities concerned for redressal of his grievance. The respondents in turn shall duly consider the representation and intimate the petitioner so far as the claim that she has made is concerned.
4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge