

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

**Pronounced on : 09.04.2026
Uploaded on : 15.04.2026**

WP(C) No. 398/2023

Puran Chand & Anr.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ajay Abrol, Advocate

Vs

**Jammu Municipal Corporation,
Th. Its Commissioner, Jammu & Anr.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAHUL BHARTI, JUDGE
ORDER
(09.04.2026)

- 01.** The core of the two petitioners' individual grievance in the writ petition is that on account of their respective service on Daily Wage basis **w.e.f. 2012 and 2013** respectively as Sanitation Workers in Municipal Corporation, Jammu, they were entitled to be considered for regularization along with the similarly engaged and situated Sanitation Workers on Daily Wage basis who came to be regularized.
- 02.** The petitioners' representation for the purposed file has remained unconsidered at the end of the Municipal Corporation, Jammu and, therefore, the petitioners came forward with a prayer for writ of mandamus unto the writ respondents to regularize the petitioners' service as

Sanitation Worker on the analogy of other similarly situated workers who became beneficiaries in terms of an **Order No. 54 of 2023 dated 17.01.2023.**

03. Reply to the writ petition has been filed from the end of the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Jammu, in which it is said that the petitioners' engagement was on need basis for which their wages were being released by the Engineering Wing out of the funds sanctioned/released after accord of the administrative approval but their names were not mentioned in the administrative approval whereas the sanitation workers (Casual Labourers/Safaikaramcharis) who came to be regularized in terms of said order dated **17.01.2023** were engaged on casual basis in the **year 2012, 2013 and 2014** after following due selection process.

04. Except for a bald statement that there was a selection process related to engagement of sanitation workers of 2012, 2013 and 2014 who later on became beneficiaries of regularization in terms of an order dated **17.01.2023**, there is no supporting document accompanying the reply/response to the writ petition from the end of Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Jammu, to exhibit the process by virtue of which regularization exercise was undertaken qua the casual basis engaged workers of

2012, 2013 and 2014 said to be engaged by following due selection process.

05. Be that as it may, this Court is of the opinion that without venturing into adjudication on merits the claim of the petitioners for their regularization, the first call is to be taken by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Jammu, by dealing expressly with the respective case of the two petitioners as to how and why they are not eligible to be considered for regularization, in case they are still continuing to be on the pay roll of Municipal Corporation, Jammu, by serving as sanitation workers thereby serving the public cause.

06. Therefore, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Jammu, to consider the present writ petition of the petitioners as a representation and dispose of it within a period of three months by or before **09.07.2026**.

07. The consideration order whatsoever may come to be passed by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Jammu, shall be bearing reasons in the factual backdrop of the claim of the petitioners as set up in the writ petition.

08. *Disposed of.*

09. A copy of this order be provided to Mr. Mayank Gupta,
learned Standing Counsel for the Municipal Corporation,
Jammu.

(RAHUL BHARTI)
JUDGE

JAMMU
09.04.2026
SUNIL

Whether the order is speaking ? : Yes/No
Whether the order is reportable ? : Yes/No

