



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPSS/1334/2026</u> Mohit Singh --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>WPSS/1335/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1336/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1337/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1338/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1339/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1340/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1341/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1342/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1343/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1344/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1345/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1346/2026</u> <u>WPSS/1347/2026</u> <u>Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J</u> 1. Mr. Abhijay Negi, learned counsel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. R.C. Joshi, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. Mr. Rajendra Arya, Advocate holding brief of Mr. Neeraj Garg, learned counsel for the respondent-UPNL. 4. Since common questions of law and fact are involved in these petitions, therefore, they are being heard and decided together. However, for the sake of brevity and convenience, facts of WPSS No. 1334 of 2026 alone are being considered and discussed.



			5. Petitioner claims to have been appointed in 2014, as Computer Operator in Rajaji Tiger Reserve, Haridwar. According to him, he was initially engaged through M/s Garg Contract Services, Dehradun, and thereafter, he was engaged through UPNL on 31.03.2016. It is not in dispute that petitioner was thereafter engaged through Ujjawal Labour Contract Co-operative Society Ltd. w.e.f. 2016, and ultimately, he was re-engaged through UPNL since 2019. 6. By means of this writ petition, petitioner has sought the following reliefs:- (i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents to include the present petitioner for conferring all the benefits that the respondent state intends to confer, vide its GO dated 03.02.2026, r/w the amended GO dated 20.02.2026. (Annexure No. 4; Pages 55 to 59). (ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding that the respondents treat the petitioner for the benefit of equal pay for equal work qua similarly placed persons such as the petitioner (Annexure No. 5; Pages 60 to 61). (iii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents to consider the claim of regularization of the petitioner. (iv) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents to count the services of the petitioner from their initial date of joining (Annexure No. 2; Pages 30 to 31) for the benefit of conferring the advantage of the government order of 10.05.2023 (Annexure No. 10; Pages 73 to 75).
--	--	--	---



			(v) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus to not alter the service conditions of the petitioners to their detriment by reducing pay or imposing punitive transfers on the petitioners. 7. According to petitioner, although a Government Order has been issued on 03.02.2026, which provides for certain benefits to outsource employee, however, such benefit is limited to those who are engaged through UPNL. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon Government Order dated 16.08.2019 for contending that petitioners are entitled to similar treatment as is being extended to those contract employees engaged through UPNL. 8. Learned State Counsel, however, submits that the Government Order dated 03.02.2026 was issued in compliance of judgment dated 12.11.2018 rendered in WPIL No. 116 of 2028 (Kundan Singh v. State & others) and the contempt proceedings initiated to execute that order. Learned State Counsel, however, submits that if petitioner has any grievance in the matter, then he can approach the Competent Authority by making representation. 9. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that Authorities of Forest Department are now making recovery of <i>Protsahan Bhatta</i> (Incentive Allowance) which was paid to petitioners immediately upon completion of ten years of service.
--	--	--	--



10. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petitions are disposed of with liberty to petitioners to make fresh representation(s) to the Director, Rajaji Tiger Reserve. If petitioners make separate representations within two weeks from today, Director concerned shall take decision thereupon, as per law, within ten weeks thereafter. For a period of three months or till decision is taken on the representation(s), whichever is earlier, no recovery shall be made from the petitioners.

(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J)

29.06.2026

Aswal

NITI RAJ
SINGH
ASWAL