

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 1085 of 2015

1. Sujit Banjare S/O Late Reshamlal Banjare Aged About 42 years R/O Village- Devari, Post Office Katnai, Police Station & Tahsil- Akaltara, Civil And Revenue District Janjgir Champa, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary Municipal Administration And Development Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Secretary, Department Of General Administration, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, Distt Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Municipal Corporation, Korba, Acting Through Commissioner, Korba, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Collector, Korba, Tahsil & District Korba, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	Shri Devesh Kela, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Shri P.K. Bhaduri, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

27/04/2015

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

1. Grievance of the petitioner is that though the petitioner is working as daily wager since 1990, 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

Gowri

¹ (2006) 4 SCC 1