



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 926 of 2026

18 August, 2026

Ramesh Kumar Alias Ramesh Chandra & another

--Petitioners

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Narendra Bali, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

Mr. Neeraj Garg, learned counsel for respondent no.5-UPNL.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

Petitioner has challenged the order dated 09.01.2026, passed by respondent no.4, whereby the representation of the petitioners has been rejected.

2. Petitioner no.1 and petitioner no.2 were initially engaged as contractual Bandi Rakshaks in Sub-Jail Roorkee, District Haridwar, through outsource agency-UPNL. Petitioner no.1 worked as a contractual Bandi Rakshak for 18 years and petitioner no.2 for 15 years. Suddenly, the petitioners were disengaged on 22.03.2024. Petitioners challenged their disengagement by filing WPSS No.405 of 2024, *Ramesh Kumar @ Ramesh Chandra & another vs. State of Uttarakhand & others*, before this Court. The said writ petition was disposed of by this Court vide judgment and order dated 14.03.2024, directing respondent no.4 to decide the representation of the petitioners, if filed by them, within a period of two weeks from the date of production of a certified copy of that order by a reasoned and speaking order. Petitioners submitted their representation. Representation submitted by them were rejected vide order dated



2026:UHC:7422

22.03.2024. The same was challenged by the petitioners by filing yet another WPSS No.809 of 2024, *Ramesh Kumar @ Ramesh Chandra & another vs. State of Uttarakhand & others*, before this Court. Co-ordinate Bench of this Court disposed of the writ petition vide judgment and order dated 18.11.2025, directing respondent no.4 to decide the fresh representations submitted by them within six weeks from the date of filing of such representations, on the ground that petitioners alleged that 7 posts of Bandi Rakshak were vacant in Sub-Jail Roorkee. Unfortunately, this representation was also rejected by the order which is impugned in the present writ petition. The representation of the petitioners was rejected by respondent no.4 on the ground that there exists a Government Order dated 25.04.2025, whereby the State Government has taken a decision not to fill up the posts in the department through an outsource agency.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the reason for not accommodating the petitioners in the background of the Government Order dated 25.04.2025 is totally unsustainable for the reason that petitioners are not seeking fresh engagement as contractual Bandi Rakshaks; rather, since they had worked for more than 18 and 15 years, respectively, as Bandi Rakshaks, the said Government Order is not attracted in the case of the petitioners for their re-engagement. He further submits that there are two vacancies of Bandi Rakshaks in District Jail, Haridwar and 27 vacancies in District Jail Haridwar as per the information received under RTI Act and, keeping in view their long-standing service as contractual Bandi



Rakshaks with the respondent authority, they can be accommodated for contractual employment with the respondents against these vacancies.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners passed on the information supplied to the petitioners by the In-charge, District Jail, Haridwar, under the RTI Act, and the same is taken on record. According to this information, there are two vacancies of Bandi Rakshaks in Sub-Jail Roorkee, District Haridwar, while 27 posts are vacant in District Jail, Haridwar.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the record of the case, this Court is of the view that the argument which has been made by learned counsel for the petitioners deserves some consideration. Since petitioners had worked with respondent no.4 for 18 and 15 years as contractual Bandi Rakshaks and now there are two posts of Bandi Rakshaks still vacant in Sub-Jail Roorkee, District, Haridwar and 27 posts of Bandi Rakshak in District Jail Haridwar, just to give protection to the petitioners for their long-standing service, the respondents can be directed to accommodate them against those vacancies purely on a contractual basis.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is allowed. The order dated 09.01.2026, passed by respondent no.4 is hereby quashed. Respondent no.4 is directed by a writ of mandamus to accommodate the petitioners against the vacancies mentioned in para 5 of this order.



2026:UHC:7422

7. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
18.08.2026

AK
AVNEE
TKAUR