

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 2998 of 2019

1. Madan Lal Sahu S/o Late Rajlal Sahu Aged About 46 Years R/o Village Tolga Police Station Khadgawa Post Office Podi Bachra Block Khadgawa District Koriya Chhattisgarh., District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh
2. Chandra Bhan Singh S/o Late Shivmangal Singh Aged About 44 Years R/o Village Jilda Police Station Khadgawa, Post Office Podi Bachra Block Khadgawa District Koriya Chhattisgarh., District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh
3. Manoj Kumar Vishwakarma S/o Shri Vishram Vishwakarma Aged About 42 Years R/o Village Khadgawa, Post Office Podi Bachra Block Khadgawa District Koriya Chhattisgarh., District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Collector Baikunthpur, Collectors Office Baikunthpur District Koriya Chhattisgarh., District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh
3. The Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat Khadgawa District Koriya Chhattisgarh., District : Koriya (Baikunthpur), Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Shakti Raj Sinha, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Ishan Verma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

24/04/2019

1. Grievance of the petitioners is that they were appointed as Shikshakarmi vide Annexure P/1 (filed collectively) along with number of other persons including those whose names find place in the document Annexure P/3.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that after about 2 ½ months of service, the petitioners 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

and 13.07.2017. He submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if at this stage the petitioners are 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 petitioners 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 petitioners case would be considered strictly in accordance with law subject to their suitability.
4. In view of above, the petitioners are permitted to withdraw this petition with the aforesaid liberty. In the eventuality of filing fresh representation along with copy of this order by the petitioners 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 (Annexure P/3) 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

Ved