

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 1275 of 2015

1. Devnath Sahu S/O Shri Baisakhu Sahu Aged About 45 years R/O Village And Post Semariya, Tahsil Kasdole District Baloda Bazar Bhatapra Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, P.S. Rakhi Tahsil Aarang, Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Superintendent Engineer Water Resources Division Civil Line Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Sub Divisional Officer Water Resources Department Balamdehi And Kantara Survey Sub Division Kasdol Post And Tahsil Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapra Chhattisgarh
4. Executive Engineer Water Resources Department, Kasdol, District Baloda Bazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For petitioner	Shri K.P. Sahu, Advocate for the petitioner.
For Respondent	Shri Shashank Thakur, GA for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order on Board

15/04/2015

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

1. Grievance of the petitioner is that though the petitioner is working as daily wager since a long period, but the petitioner's case is not being considered for his regularization in accordance with the circular of the State Government dated 5-3-2008.

2. In reply to above, State counsel submits that if the petitioner files fresh representation along with copy of the petition, the same shall be considered in accordance with law.
3. In view of the above, the petition stands disposed of. If the petitioner files fresh representation along with copy of the petition, then competent authority of the respondent authorities are directed to consider and decide the petitioner's case for regularization strictly in accordance with State Government's circular dated 5-3-2008 issued in compliance of the decision of the Supreme Court in **Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others v. Umadevi (3) and Others**¹, on its own merits and in accordance with law, as early as possible, preferably, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of representations.
4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authorities shall decide the representation, on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law, without treating any observation made in this order, as opinion on the merits of the case.

J u d g e

Ashu/
Gowri

¹ (2006) 4 SCC 1

