

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2943 of 2019**

1. Somee Ram Netam, S/o Dashrath Netam, aged about 37 years, working as Lecturer (Panchayat) at Govt. Higher Secondary School Banskot, Block Baderajpur, District Kondagaon (C.G.)
2. Dilharan Uike, S/o Alal Ram, aged about 37 years, working as Lecturer (Panchayat) at Govt. Higher Secondary School Korgaon, Block Baderajpur, district Kondagaon (C.G.)
3. Shravan Kumar Thakur, S/o Ramji, aged about 35 years, working as Lecturer (Panchayat) at Govt. High School Badgai, block Farasgaon, District Kondagaon (C.G.)
4. Smt. Rewti Mandavi W/o Kamlesh mandavi, aged about 34 years, working as Lecturer (Panchayat) at Govt. Higher Secondary School Singhanpur, Block Keshkal, District Kondagaon (C.G.)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mahanadi bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur(C.G.)
2. Director, Directorate of Public Instruction, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat, Kondagaon, District Kondagaon (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Govind Dewangan, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Ms. Shriya Mishra, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****22.04.2019**

1. The instant writ petition has been filed by the petitioners aggrieved of the inaction on part of the respondents in not confirming the services of the petitioners though they have been appointed and working with the respondents since 2011-12 onwards.
2. According to the counsel for the petitioners, under the rules governing the field, the confirmation could not have been extended beyond the period of 5 years which, in the present case, also have been completed long back. He further submits that, till date, there is no order passed by the respondents so far as the claims of the petitioners are concerned, either entitling or dis-entitling them from the benefits.
3. Given the aforesaid submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners, this Court is of the opinion that, no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the writ petition pending, rather ends of justice would meet if the writ petition is disposed off with a direction to the respondent No. 3 to take a decision so far as the claim of the petitioners for confirmation is concerned.
4. Let this exercise be done within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
5. This writ petition accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE