



S.B. (Service Matter)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

WRIT PETITION(S) NO. 3978/2013.

PETITIONER:

Roop Narayan Dewangan, son of Satte Prasad Dewangan, aged about 29 years, working as Shikshak Panchayat, Govt. Middle School, Daldali, Block and P.S. Kasdole, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

Versus

Respondents

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mantralaya P.S.Rakhi, Tahsil Aarang, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. Director.
- Chief Executive Officer,
 Zila Panchayat, Raipur, P.S.City
 Kotwali, Raipur, District Raipur,
 Chhattisgarh. Durg, Chhattisgarh.
 - Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Kasdole, P.S. Kasdole, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
- Block Education Officer, Block Kasdole, P.S. Kasdole, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

The petitioner named above begs to submit as under :-

PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER:
 As stated in the cause title above.





<u>HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR</u>

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA, J.

W.P. (S) No. 3968 of 2013

PETITIONER

Tej Kumar Netam.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3969 of 2013

PETITIONER

Pradeep Kumar Jangde.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3970 of 2013

PETITIONER

Rikeshwar Prasad Markandey.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3971 of 2013

PETITIONER

Ram Kumar Verma.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3972 of 2013

<u>PETITIONER</u>

Om Prakash Sahu.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3973 of 2013

PETITIONER

Gokul Krishna Choudhary.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3974 of 2013

PETITIONER

Yogesh Kumar Sahu.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3975 of 2013

PETITIONER

Manoj Kumar Khuteshwar.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3976 of 2013

PETITIONER

Raju Basod.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3977 of 2013

PETITIONER

Ishwari Prasad Verma.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3978 of 2013

PETITIONER

Roop Narayan Dewangan.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3979 of 2013

PETITIONER

Mishri Lal Sahu.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3980 of 2013

PETITIONER

Kusumlata Gahilware.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3981 of 2013

PETITIONER

Panna Lal Dewangan.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3983 of 2013

PETITIONER

Suresh Kumar Bariha.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3984 of 2013

PETITIONER

Sampat Kumar Sahu.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3985 of 2013

PETITIONER

Rameshwari Sahu.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3986 of 2013

PETITIONER

Shyam Lal Thakur.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3988 of 2013

PETITIONER

Suresh Kumar Sahu.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3989 of 2013

PETITIONER

Ved Prakash Dewangan.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

W.P. (S) No. 3990 of 2013

PETITIONER

Vrihaspatu Singh Vishal.

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

<u>AND</u>

W.P. (S) No. 3991 of 2013

PETITIONER

Kamlesh Kumar Verma.

Versus

<u>RESPONDENTS</u>

State of Chhattisgarh and others.

Shri CJK Rao, counsel for petitioners.

Shri Ajay Dwivedi, Dy. Govt. Advocate with Miss Raksha Awasthy, Shri Prasun Bhaduri and Shri Adil Minhaj, Panel Lawyer for the State, on advance copy.

ORAL ORDER (29/11/2013)

Petitioners are working as Shiksha Karmi Grade-I/II/Teacher (Panchayat)/Lecturer (Panchayat), as the case may be. They have prayed

36

for a direction to the respondents to count their previous service period from the initial date of appointment for providing benefit of pay scale in view of the circular dated 17/05/2013.

- 2. This prayer has been made on the ground that benefit of circular has been extended to similarly placed Shiksha Karmis in several other districts.
- 3. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that for the present, the writ petitions may be disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the petitioners' representation for according to benefit of the circular within stipulated time.
- 4. In view of the limited relief claimed at this stage, the writ petitions are disposed of with a direction that in the event the petitioners submit a fresh representation raising all their grievances for grant of benefit of pay scale in view of the circular dated 17/05/2013, the competent authority shall consider and decide the representation as early as possible and pass express and reasoned order within a period of three months from the date of submission of representation.
- 5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the representation, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order as opinion on the merits of the case.

Sd//-Prashant Kumar Mishra Judge