



2026:CGHC:14707



2026:CGHC:14707

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 11814 of 2025

1 - Vandana Lahre W/o Birendra Lahre Aged About 42 Years Presently Posted As Teacher (L.B.), Middle School Sambalpuri, Takhatpur, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh, R/o Kapsiya Kala, Tanda, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... **Petitioner**

Versus

1 - The State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of School Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh 492002

2 - The Secretary Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh 492002

3 - The Director Directorate Of Public Instruction, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Indravati Bhavan District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

4 - District Collector District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

5 - District Education Officer District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

6 - Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat, Takhatpur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Mr. Prateek Modi, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Shalvik Tiwari, Advocate

For Respondents-State : Mr. Aditya Tiwari, Panel Lawyer

S.B. Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu

Order On Board

30/03/2026



1. Petitioner has filed this petition seeking following relief (s) :-

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for records pertaining to the services of the petitioner from the respondents.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may issue an appropriate writ or direction on the Respondent Authority concerned to grant benefit of “Kramonnati Vetanman” to the petitioner with effect from 02.07.2017 (after completing 10 years of service).

10.3 This Hon'ble Court may issue an appropriate writ or direction on the Respondent Authority concerned to grant arrears of the revised pay-scale after grant of Kramonnati Vetanman.

10.4 That, this Hon'ble Court may issue an appropriate writ or direction to respondent authority concerned to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 04.10.2024.

10.5 That, the Hon'ble Court may grant any other relief as this Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper in the nature and circumstances of the present case in the interest of justice.”gh

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner is entitled for Kramonnati Vetanman in terms of decision in case of ***Sona Sahu Vs. State of Chhattisgarh***, in ***W.A. No. 261 of 2023***, decided on 28.02.2024.
3. Learned State counsel opposes the submission of learned counsel for petitioner and would submit that case of the petitioner is different than that of case of ***Sona Sahu (Supra)***. Petitioner was earlier employee of Panchayat Department and thereafter, he was absorbed in Education Department pursuant to policy decision taken by State Government on 30.06.2018. Petitioner was not appointed as regular Assistant Teachers



by School Education Department but was appointed by Janpad Panchayat. Coordinate Bench of this Court has considered the issue with regard to grant of Kramonnati Vetanman to such employee in **WPS No.11009 of 2025** and other batch of writ petitions and has dismissed those writ petitions.

4. Petitioner upon asking do not dispute the submission of learned State counsel with respect to his initial appointment under Panchayat Department by Janpad Panchayat as also decision in **WP(S) No.11009 of 2025**.
5. The Coordinate Bench of this Court while considering the batch of writ petitions lead case bearing **WPS No. 11009 of 2025** with regard to grant of Kramonnati to petitioners therein, has dismissed the writ petitions and observed thus :-

“35. Considering the facts of the case that the petitioners till absorption in pursuance of the policy dated 30.06.2018 are not teachers of the School Education Department, they were shikshakarmis though their designation has been changed as Assistant Teacher (panchayat), Teacher (panchayat) and Lecturer (panchayat) respectively and they are governed by the separate rules framed under the Panchayat Raj Adhiniyam, 1993, therefore, the petitioners are not fulfilling the criteria as laid down in the circular dated 10.03.2017, the bunch of the writ petitions are liable to be dismissed, accordingly, they are dismissed.”

6. Since the facts of the case of petitioner as is identical to the facts of the case in **WP(S) No.11009 of 2025** is not disputed, this petition is also



dismissed in terms of order passed in **WPS No.11009 of 2025** and
other connected case decided on 24.11.2025.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Dey