

GAHC020006312022



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

Case No. : WP(C)/239/2022

SHRI. NUHUTA
CODE NO.PHK-0293,
W/C KHALASI,
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER(PHED),
PHEK DIVISION, PHEK, NAGALAND

VERSUS

THE STATE OF NAGALAND AND 4 ORS
THROUGH THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND,
NAGALAND, KOHIMA

2:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
NAGALAND

PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS DEPARTMENT
NAGALAND
KOHIMA

3:THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF
NAGALAND

PHED
NAGALAND
KOHIMA

4:THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PHED
NAGALAND
KOHIMA

5:THE EXECUTVE ENGINEER

PHED
PHEK DIVISION
PHEK
NAGALAN

Advocate for the Petitioner : SUPONGWATI WALLING

Advocate for the Respondent : GOVT ADV NL

**BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NELSON SAILO**

ORDER

20.08.2024

Parties are represented by their respective counsels.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that he is entitled to be considered for regularization of his employment as Work-Charged *Khalasi* in Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Nagaland, in terms of the relevant Government policy.

3. Against the writ petition the State respondents have filed their counter affidavit. In paragraph No. 5 of the counter affidavit, it has been stated that the file of the petitioner as well as other similarly situated persons have been put up before the Personnel & Administrative Reforms Department on 06.04.2021 and it was cleared by the said Department on 24.11.2022. Thereafter, the file was sent to the Finance Department for their concurrence.

4. Ms. S. Mere, learned Senior Government Advocate submits that although she has not received written instructions but she has been informed that even the Finance

Department has cleared the case of the petitioner and the file is being submitted to the Manpower Rationalization Committee for their consideration. Once the same is done it will be send to the Cabinet for approval. Learned State counsel, therefore, submits that in view of such development the writ petition can be disposed of even at this stage.

5. Mr. Supongwati Walling, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the case of the petitioner for regularization is proceeding in a positive direction, the petitioner at this stage would not like to press the writ petition. He however, submits that the respondent authorities may be directed to complete the process within a time-frame.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the fact that the case of the petitioner for regularization is being processed in the right earnest this Court finds it expedient to dispose of the writ petition at this stage with the observation that the respondents do the needful for regularization of the petitioner as expeditiously as possible.

7. Writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Comparing Assistant