

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 4037 of 2020**

1. Tushar Shukla S/o Late Shri B.P. Shukla Aged About 51 Years R/o Bramhan Para, Ward No. 38, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District Chhattisgarh
2. Prakash Sahu S/o Shri Mukud Sahu Aged About 46 Years R/o Bangali Chaal Basatpur, Ward No. 43 Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District Durg Chhattisgarh.
3. Tikendra Kumar Sahu S/o Shri Kapileshwar Prasad Sahu Aged About 40 Years R/o Pendri Ward No. 20, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District Durg Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Indravati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Directorate Urban Administration And Development, Through Its Director, Mahanadi Bhavan, Raipur, Tahsil And District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Municipal Corporation Rajnandgaon Through Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
4. Mayor - In - Council Through The Mayor Municipal Corporation Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
5. Departmental Promossion Committee Through Its Chairman Municipal Corporation Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Somkant Verma, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Richa Shukla, Dy. G.A.
For Respondent No. 3	:	Shri Sourabh Sharma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****12.10.2020**

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would that the petitioners No. 1 & 2 were appointed on 01.10.2008 and petitioner No. 3 on 07.09.2009. Subsequently. they were absorbed on the post of Assistant Grade - III on 06.10.2018 (Annexure P-4). Thereafter, the gradation list was published on 20.09.2019, whereby the petitioners name appeared at Serial No. 5, 6 & 7. Subsequently, a fresh gradation

list was published on 01.01.2020 whereby the name of the petitioners appeared at Serial No. 23, 24 & 25. It is contended that without giving any opportunity of hearing petitioners seniority has been affected and petitioners were though placed at higher position they have been brought to the bottom of the list. Under the circumstances the petitioners have made a representation (Annexure P-5) to the Commissioner and prays that the same may be decided so that the grievance of the petitioners may be redressed.

3. Perused the documents.
4. Perusal of the documents shows that the petitioners though were placed at higher position in the first gradation list, subsequently when fresh gradation list was published on 01.01.2020, they were placed at the bottom. Considering the same, as the representation (Annexure P-5) has already been made by the petitioner to Respondent No.3. Respondent No. 3 is directed to decide the same within a further period of 90 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
5. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge