



**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL
PRADESH)
KOHIMA BENCH**

Case No. : WP(C)/324/2021

SMTI. T. ZISELA SANGTAM AND 6 ORS
SWEEPER (AD-HOC), GHSS, KIPHERE, NAGALAND 2: SHRI.
THSATHRONGCHUM
PEON(AD-HOC)
GHSS
KIPHIRE
NAGALAND

3: SHRI. Y. YANGKHABA SANGTAM
LAB ATTENDANT (AD-HOC)
GHSS
KIPHIRE
NAGALAND

4: SHRI. THRELIMONG SANGTAM
MALI (AD-HOC)
GHSS
KIPHIRE
NAGALAND

5: SHRI. T CHOPISE SANGTAM
PEON (AD-HOC)
GMS LONGYA
KIPHIRE NAGALAND

6: SHRI. S. ALIBA SANGTAM
PEON (AD-HOC)
SDEO
KIPHIRE
NAGALAND

7: SHRI. T. SELIKYU SANGTAM
MALI(AD-HOC)
GMS

CHANGCHOR
KIPHIRE
NAGALAN

VERSUS

THE STATE OF NAGALAND AND 2 ORS
THROUGH THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
NAGALAND, DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, NAGALAND-KOHIMA

2:THE STATE OF NAGALAND

THROUGH THE SPECIAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION
NAGALAND KOHIMA

3:THE PRINCIPAL DIRECTOR
DIRECTORATE OF SCHOOL EDUCATION
NAGALAND KOHIMA

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Moa Jamir, Advocate

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. Inaholi Wotsa, Government Advocate

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEVASHIS BARUAH

ORDER

Date : 06.06.2024

Heard Mr. Moa Jamir, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioners and Ms. Inaholi Wotsa, the learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of the State Respondents.

2. The Petitioners herein who are the Grade-IV employees working on ad-hoc basis have filed the instant writ petition for consideration of their case in terms with the Office Memorandum dated 11.08.2016.

3. It has been brought to the attention of this Court that on

16.03.2024, an Office Memorandum has been issued by the Government of Nagaland, Department of Personnel Administrative Reforms whereby a policy was taken on regularization of Group-C and Group-D Contract and Ad-hoc employees who were appointed prior to 06.06.2016.

4. Mr. Moa Jamir, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submits that as the Petitioners were appointed prior to 06.06.2016 on ad-hoc basis, their cases would be covered in terms with the Office Memorandum dated 16.03.2024. He therefore submits that the case of the Petitioners now ought to be considered by the Respondent Authorities in terms with the said Office Memorandum dated 16.03.2024. He further submits that as the earlier Office Memorandums are no longer in existence, the Petitioners would not therefore like to press the instant writ petition. The learned counsel submits that in the circumstance the Petitioners' case is not considered in terms with the Office Memorandum dated 16.03.2024, the Petitioners should not be precluded from approaching this Court.

5. Taking into account the Office Memorandum dated 16.03.2024, this Court is of the opinion that the said Office Memorandum deals with cases like the Petitioners. Under such circumstances, this Court closes the instant writ petition on withdrawal.

6. However, it is made clear that the withdrawal of the instant writ petition shall not preclude the Petitioners to approach this Court in the circumstance the Petitioners' case

is not considered in terms with the Office Memorandum dated 16.03.2024.

Sd/-

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant