

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 7942/2014 & CM APPL.18623/2014**

% 26th May,2015

DR. PARMOD KUMAR DHAILWAL Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Ms. Peeyosh Kalra, Advocate Addl.
Standing Counsel GNCT of Delhi.
Ms. Latika Chaudhary, Advocate for
Govt. of NCT of Delhi.

+ **W.P.(C) 8194/2014 & CM APPL.19071/2014**

DR. SAURABH PURWAR & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT)

+ **W.P.(C) 8209/2014 & CM APPL.19092/2014**

SURESH CHANDRA & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT)

+ **W.P.(C) 8210/2014 & CM APPL.19094/2014**

DR. RAJENDRA KUMAR SONI & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.
versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT)

+ **W.P.(C) 8211/2014 & CM APPL.19096/2014**

NARENDER KUMAR BISHT & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.
versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through : Ms. Sonia Arora, Adv.

+ **W.P.(C) 8473/2014 & CM APPL.19607/2014**

R.N. GARG Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr. Satyakam, Advocate Addl. Standing
Counsel for GNCTD.

+ **W.P.(C) 9392/2014 & CM APPL.21226/2014**

DR. MONIKA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents

Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT)

+ **W.P.(C) 7936/2014 & CM APPL.18613/2014**

POONAM KUMAR Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.
versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents
Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT)

+ **W.P.(C) 8824/2014 & CM APPL.20256/2014**

DR. MUKESH KUMAR SHARMA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents
Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT)

+ **W.P.(C) 8458/2014 & CM APPL.19569/2014**

DR. ASHOK KUMAR MADAN SINGH Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sourabh Ahuja, Advocate.

versus

GNCT OF DELHI & ORS Respondents
Through: Ms. Sangeeta Sondhi, Advocate for
respondent (GNCT).
Mr. Rajesh Gogna (CGSC) with Ms. L.
Gangmee, Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

To be referred to the Reported or not?

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J (ORAL)

W.P.(C) 7942/2014 & CM APPL.18623/2014

1. In this writ petition the following reliefs are sought:

“(a) Quash and set aside the advertisement dated 01.11.2014 qua the post of Deputy Director (Administration)

(b) Direct the respondents to honor/implement their conscious decision taken in Governing Council Meetings (08.06.2012 in Agenda no.4 (5) and 24.09.2013 in Agenda no.10) by considering regularization the services of the petitioner to the post of Deputy Director (Administration) with all consequential benefits;

(c) Pass any further order, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just equitable in the facts and circumstances of the case,

(d) Award cost in favour of the petitioner and against the respondents.”
(underlining added)

2. Connected writ petitions titled as ***Radhey Shyam and Ors. Vs. GNCT of Delhi and Ors.*** in W.P.(C) No. 471/2015 and ***Som Dutt and Ors. Vs. GNCT of Delhi and Ors.*** in W.P. (C) No. 474/2015 were dismissed by this Court vide judgment dated 22.1.2015 and this Court made the following observations for denying the claim of regularization to the persons similarly placed to petitioner in ***Som Dutt's (supra)*** case :

“14. Petitioners in this case seek appointment as Lab Technicians/Lab Assistants. In the present case, the relief which is claimed by the petitioners of their being regularized cannot be granted because if petitioners are specifically appointed for contractual period in terms of the advertisement which required only contractual employment for 11 months, then, if the petitioners are regularized only because they were appointed against sanctioned

posts, the same would be clearly a violation of the ratio of the Constitution Bench judgment in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* because if the petitioners are directed to be regularized merely because there existed sanctioned posts, although the advertisement and appointments were only and specifically for 11 months only, then what will happen is that by issuing of an advertisement by the respondent no.2 which was only for contractual appointments of a limited period of 11 months, injustice would be caused to dozens or hundreds of other persons who would not have applied to the posts on the ground that the posts are contractual posts only for 11 months and such persons, being the ordinary citizens, who therefore would seek appointment with other employers who would offer permanent posts. If this Court allows regularization of the petitioners, and merely because petitioners are appointed against sanctioned posts, the spirit of the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* would be violated because then in such cases the authorities of the State instead of making regular appointments to sanctioned posts, will advertise and make contractual appointments to sanctioned posts for specified periods, and thereby play a fraud upon general public being persons who would have applied if the posts were advertised as permanent posts. Thus regularization cannot be granted only because petitioners were appointed against sanctioned posts, once the advertisement and appointments were only for a limited period of just 11 months.

15. It is not the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* that contractual employees must be regularized only because there are vacant sanctioned posts to which they were appointed to limited contractual period of mere 11 months, inasmuch as, *Umadevi (supra)* requires that the appointments must be as per the regular recruitment process and rules which will require advertisement for appointments as permanent posts, and much less because in terms of the ratio of the *Umadevi's case (supra)*, the Delhi State Services Selection Board (DSSSB), and who appoints employees for the respondent no.2, has already issued a circular that there should not be appointments to regular posts except in accordance with the law and the process as specified in the regular recruitment rules.”

3. At this stage, I may also state that para 12 of the judgment dated 22.1.2015 passed by this Court in *Radhey Shyam's (supra)* case specifically records the

aspect that it was put to the petitioners that their services could be protected but the petitioners insisted only on regularization. This para 12 reads as under :

“12. After conclusion of arguments I put it to the counsel for the petitioners that instead of regularization, this Court can grant the relief that contractual employees such as the petitioners should not be replaced by other contractual employees, but the counsel for the petitioners after taking instructions states that petitioners insist only on regularization, but this relief of regularization this Court cannot grant as discussed above.”

4. The judgment in *Som Dutt's case (supra)* was taken in appeal before a Division Bench of this Court and Division Bench of this Court in LPA No. 161/2015 passed the following order dated 24.03.2015:

“

1. We have heard learned counsel for the parties.
 2. Vide impugned order dated January 22, 2015 three writ petitions have been dismissed in limine by the learned Single Judge.
 3. We find that all the relevant facts have not been noted by the learned Single Judge.
 4. We do not blame the learned Single Judge for the reason we find that the writ petition is prolix; full of verbosity. And in the process the real issue has been lost.
 5. Apart from the real issue which we have bringing out hereinafter we find that on February 16, 2015 an order has been passed by the Government of NCT of Delhi which reads as under:-
“No.F.19(01)/2014/S-IV/223-224 Dated: 16/02/2015
1. All Pr.Secretaries/Secretaries/HODs, Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi.
 2. All Heads of Local Bodies/Autonomous Bodies/Undetaking/Corporation/Boards/Institutions under GNCTD, Govt. of N.C.T. of Delhi.

Subject: Regarding engagement of contractual employees.

The Government of N.C.T. of Delhi would like to take a view on the existing policy regarding status of contractual employees engaged in various departments and organizations under this Government.

Therefore, services of Contractual employees engaged by the departments should NOT be terminated till further instructions in the matter. If any terminations are likely to take place, the same should be stopped till further orders.

*Sd/
(ASHUTOSH KUMAR)
SPL.SECRETARY (SERVICES)”*

6. In view of the order dated February 16, 2015 the question of terminating services of the appellants pending further decision by the Government of NCT of Delhi does not arise and to that extent the appellants would be entitled to a declaration that the respondents would be bound by the order dated February 16, 2015, contents whereof have been noted above.

7. As regards the merits of the controversy, case pleaded by the petitioners before the learned Single Judge was that the respondent No.2 is a body wholly uncontrolled and managed by the Government of NCT of Delhi and thus would be a State within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution of India.

8. It is the further case of the appellants that after it was incorporated, the second respondent issued an advertisement on January 04, 2012 to fill up posts of Library Technicians, Library Assistants, Panchkarma Technicians and Museum Keepers, indicating that initially appointment would be on contract for a period of 11 months likely to continue up to 3 years or till when regular appointments were made.

9. In the absence of recruitment rules the recruitment was effected by subjecting all those who responded to the advertisement dated January 04, 2012 to a written test and an interview.

10. As per the appellants the service of the appellants was extended from time to time. The governing body of the second respondent finalized the recruitment rules and sent the same for approval.

11. Realizing that the appellants may have become overage, it is pleaded in the writ petition, that the governing body of the second respondent resolved that benefit of age relaxation should be given to the existing employees, requiring the recruitment rules which were yet to be finalized to be suitably amended before being finalized. It was pleaded that thereafter the governing body took a decision to seek the approval of the Government to regularize the service of the contractual paramedic employees and continue with the appointment on contract basis in the meanwhile.

12. There is a disconnect in the pleadings thereafter inasmuch as, like a mushroom popping during monsoon, it is pleaded that the appellants feared discontinuation of their service, simultaneously pleading that on January 27, 2014 (and the document has been annexed as Annexure P-12 to the writ petition), that the Government of NCT of Delhi appointed a committee to look into the regularization of services of temporary, contractual and casual employees.

13. While dismissing the writ petitions the learned Single Judge has treated as if there were no vacant posts when appellants were appointed. The learned Single Judge has held that existence of a vacant post was the sine qua non for a claim of regularization as per the decision of the Supreme Court reported as (2006) 4 SCC 1 Secretary State of Karnataka & Ors. Vs. Uma Devi & Ors.

14. The learned Single Judge has overlooked the fact that in the absence of the approved recruitment rules all appointments were being made ad-hoc or on contract basis. The posts were sanctioned on account of the fact that budgetary grant was being made by the Government of NCT of Delhi.

15. The learned Single Judge overlooked that on January 27, 2014 the Government of NCT of Delhi had constituted a committee to look into the matter.

16. Instant case was of a kind where the writ petition ought not to have been disposed of on the first day itself for the reason a counter affidavit was warranted to find out what steps have been taken by the Government pursuant to the office order dated January 27, 2014.

17. Ordinarily we ought to have set aside the impugned order and remanded the matter for a fresh decision to be taken by the learned Single Judge but we refrain from doing so in view of the fact that on February 16, 2015 the Government of NCT of Delhi has passed an order, as noted above, which has been sent to the Head of all Local Bodies/Autonomous Bodies/Undertakings/Corporations/Boards/Institutions under Government of NCT of Delhi.

18. We dispose of the appeal setting aside the impugned order dated January 22, 2015 in so far W.P.(C) No.474/2015 has been dismissed in limine.

19. The respondents would not terminate the appellants as contractual employees so long as the work is available and under no circumstances shall replace the appellants with a contractual, ad-hoc or a temporary employee. If the respondents take a policy decision to regularize the services of the appellants that would be the end of the matter. If the decision taken is that services of the appellants cannot be regularized, till regular appointment is made or till when the work is available, whichever is earlier, service of the appellants would not be terminated.

20. If recruitment rules are framed and no policy is framed to regularize the appellants and the appellants are found to be overage, benefit of age relaxation shall be given to the appellants when applications are invited to fill up the posts held on contract by the appellants.

21. No costs.

5. It is unfortunate that the counsel for the petitioner in this case, and who was also the counsel who appeared before the Division Bench in ***Som Dutt’s (supra)*** case, did not bring to the notice of the Division Bench, para 12 of the judgment in ***Radhey Shyam’s (supra)*** case and only because of which stand the same led to the passing of the judgment as the relief was predicated on the claim of the regularization and not for continuance of services.

6. I have reproduced the order passed by the Division Bench above, and though the Division Bench has set aside the judgment of this Court in ***Som Dutt’s (supra)*** case, I note that no discernible reasons by referring to any Supreme Court judgment has been given by the Division Bench for differing with the ratio laid down in the case of ***Radhey Shyam (supra)***. Hence the order on 24.3.2015 cannot be considered as a legal precedent for holding that the judgments in the cases of ***Radhey Shyam and Ors.(supra)*** and ***Som Dutt and Ors. (supra)*** did not correctly lay down the law inasmuch as these judgments were on the basis of the specific ratio of the Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Secretary, State of Karnataka and Ors. Vs. Umadevi & Ors., 2006 (4) SCC 1*** which categorically holds that contractual/term-based employees cannot be regularized. The ratio of ***Umadevi’s*** case (***supra***) does not contain exception when contractual appointments are made in the absence of recruitment rules that

such contractual appointees can be regularized.

7. At this stage, in order to remove any doubt as to the ratio of *Umadevi's* case (*supra*) that contractual appointees cannot be regularized, I would like to reproduce para 52 of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *Official Liquidator Vs. Dayanand & Ors. (2008) 10 SCC 1* and which paragraph reproduces similar sentiments to what this Court expressed in paras 14 and 15 in the cases of *Radhey Shyam and Ors.(supra)* and *Som Dutt and Ors. (supra)*.

This para 52 reads as under :

“52. As mentioned above, while approving the reasons and conclusions recorded by the two High Courts and dismissing the appeals, this Court not only permitted the Government of India to frame a scheme modeled on the 1978 Scheme but also stayed implementation of the orders impugned in the appeal and the one passed by itself in the transferred writ petition. If the Court intended that all members of the company paid staff working on the date of judgment i.e. 27.8.1999 should be absorbed in the regular cadres against Group `C' and `D' posts, then a simple direction to that effect would have been sufficient and there was no occasion to stay the implementation of the orders of the High Courts for six months with liberty to the Government of India to frame a new scheme within the same period. The absence of such a direction shows that the Court was very much conscious of the fact that recruitment to the regular cadres is governed by the rules framed under Article [309](#) of the Constitution and it would be highly detrimental to public interest to issue direction for wholesale absorption/regularization of the company paid staff and thereby abrogate/stultify opportunity of competition to younger generation comprising more meritorious persons who may be waiting for a chance to apply for direct recruitment. Obviously, the Court did not want to sacrifice the merit by showing undue sympathy with members of the company paid staff who joined service with full knowledge about their status, terms and conditions of their employment and the fact that they were to be paid from the company fund and not Consolidated Fund of

India. In this context, we may also mention that though the Official Liquidators appear to have issued **advertisements** for appointing the company paid staff and made some sort of selection, more qualified and meritorious persons must have shunned from applying because they knew that the employment will be for a fixed term on fixed salary and their engagement will come to an end with the conclusion of liquidation proceedings. As a result of this, only mediocres must have responded to the advertisements and joined as company paid staff. **In this scenario, a direction for absorption of all the company paid staff has to be treated as violative of the doctrine of equality enshrined in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.**” (emphasis added)

8. The last few lines of the above para 52 make it abundantly clear that persons who have been appointed after advertisement, but, have been appointed only for contractual period or for term basis posts, such persons cannot be regularized. Even if advertisement is issued, but once the advertisement is only for contractual posts and not for permanent/regular appointments, then merely because appointments made are pursuant to such appointments will not satisfy the requirement of the regular recruitment rules. This position has obviously been stated by the Supreme Court because the regular recruitment through the recruitment rules which require advertisement to be issued, then the same has to mean advertisement for permanent posts and not advertisement for contractual posts. Though, para 52 of the judgment of the Supreme Court was not cited before this court when the judgment was passed in the cases of *Radhey Shyam and Ors.(supra)* and *Som Dutt and Ors. (supra)*, the sentiments expressed in

paras 14 & 15 of the judgment in the cases of ***Radhey Shyam and Ors.(supra)*** and ***Som Dutt and Ors. (supra)*** stand fully accepted by observations made in para 52 of the judgment in the case of ***Official Liquidator (supra)***. In fact, in the judgment in the case of ***Official Liquidator (supra)***, the Supreme Court came down heavily on a Division Bench judgment of two judges of the Supreme Court in the case of ***U.P. State Electricity Board Vs. Pooran Chandra Pandey & Ors., 2007 11 SCC 92*** and which Division Bench of two judges had steered away from the binding ratio of the judgment in the case of ***Umadevi (supra)***. The Supreme Court in the judgment in the case of ***Official Liquidator (supra)*** termed this as judicial indiscipline.

9. In a subsequent judgment passed by this court in the case of ***Keshav Dutt & Ors. Vs. Delhi Tourism & Transport Development Corporation Limited & Anr.*** in W.P.(C) No. 3295/2015 decided on 07.04.2015, I have once again had an occasion to consider the claim of regularization of persons who were appointed on contractual basis in terms of advertisement issued for contractual period posts only. I have referred to various Supreme Court judgments in ***Keshav Dutt & Ors.'s (supra)*** case, and which Supreme Court judgments specifically lay down the ratio that advertisements must mean advertisements only in the 'appropriate manner' i.e meaning thereby that advertisements if are issued for contractual period

posts, then the selected persons of this process cannot claim regularization. Only advertisements issued for regular posts can be taken as a basis for accepting claim by persons seeking regularization to the sanctioned vacant posts i.e posts which are advertised as regular posts and not term based or contractual posts. The rationale I had given in the judgment in the case of **Radhey Shyam and Ors. (supra)** for not regularizing contractual appointees have been reproduced in **Keshav Dutt & Ors.'s (supra)** case also. The relevant observations in **Keshav Dutt & Ors.'s (supra)** case giving reasons for not regularizing contractual period appointees read as under:-

“2. The advertisement pursuant to which petitioners were appointed is dated 26.6.2007 and this advertisement reads as under:-

“ **ADVERTISEMENT**

DTTDC required Helper/Attendant for short period
Qualification 8th passed, desire experienced qualification is two years, Maximum age 25 years for (General), 30 years for (SC/ST), 28 years for (OBC). Interview shall be take place at Garden of Five Senses, Said-Ul-Ajaib, Mehrauli Badarpur Road, New Delhi on dated 27/06/2007 at 10:30 AM. Aspiring applicants may please bring their educational certificate and experience certificates on the above mention date for the interview.

General Manager”

3. A reference to the aforesaid advertisement shows that by the advertisement appointment was sought to be made of persons as Helper/Attendant only for a short period i.e appointments which were sought to be made were not permanent appointments as distinguished from contractual/short term appointments or casual appointments. The issue is that can these persons claim regularization of their services by seeking permanent employment only on the ground that they were appointed against vacancies in sanctioned posts and they had the necessary eligibility criteria/qualifications and were recruited through the process of advertisement.

4. It is now no longer *res integra* that in terms of the Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others Vs. Umadevi (3) and Others 2006 (4) SCC 1*** before a person can seek regularization, four aspects must exist viz first of there existing sanctioned posts, second of there existing vacancies in sanctioned posts for which there exists authority/entitlement to fill up, thirdly that the persons who are appointed in vacancies against sanctioned posts are duly qualified persons, and fourthly appointment is made of persons who have been called through advertisements widely circulated so that there is open competition among the eligible persons.

5. The issue in the present case is that whether the advertisement in question reproduced above by which appointments were sought to be made only for a short period, is an advertisement in accordance with the ratio of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of ***Umadevi (supra)***.

6. I have recently had an occasion to examine this aspect in the bunch of cases with the lead case being ***Radhey Shyam & Ors. Vs. GNCT of Delhi & Ors.*** W.P.(C) No. 471/2015 decided on 22.1.2015 and I have held in this judgment that to allow regularization of contractual employees or short period appointment employees, merely because such persons meet 3 out of 4 criteria in terms of the ratio of ***Umadevi's case (supra)*** being that they are qualified persons and appointed against vacancies in sanctioned posts, the same would result in fraud upon the ratio of ***Umadevi's case (supra)*** as also the general public because the object of ***Umadevi's case (supra)*** was to prevent back-door entry and spoils system in public appointment and there cannot be regularization of employees who have got appointment in terms of the advertisement only for a fixed period. The relevant paras in ***Radhey Shyam's case (supra)*** are paras 14 and 15 and which read as under:-

“14. Petitioners in this case seek appointment as Lab Technicians/Lab Assistants. In the present case, the relief which is claimed by the petitioners of their being regularized cannot be granted because if petitioners are specifically appointed for contractual period in terms of the advertisement which required only contractual employment for 11 months, then, if the petitioners are regularized only because they were appointed against sanctioned posts, the same would be clearly a violation of

the ratio of the Constitution Bench judgment in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* because if the petitioners are directed to be regularized merely because there existed sanctioned posts, although the advertisement and appointments were only and specifically for 11 months only, then what will happen is that by issuing of an advertisement by the respondent no.2 which was only for contractual appointments of a limited period of 11 months, injustice would be caused to dozens or hundreds of other persons who would not have applied to the posts on the ground that the posts are contractual posts only for 11 months and such persons, being the ordinary citizens, who therefore would seek appointment with other employers who would offer permanent posts. If this Court allows regularization of the petitioners, and merely because petitioners are appointed against sanctioned posts, the spirit of the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* would be violated because then in such cases the authorities of the State instead of making regular appointments to sanctioned posts, will advertise and make contractual appointments to sanctioned posts for specified periods, and thereby play a fraud upon general public being persons who would have applied if the posts were advertised as permanent posts. Thus regularization cannot be granted only because petitioners were appointed against sanctioned posts, once the advertisement and appointments were only for a limited period of just 11 months.

15. It is not the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* that contractual employees must be regularized only because there are vacant sanctioned posts to which they were appointed to limited contractual period of mere 11 months, inasmuch as, *Umadevi (supra)* requires that the appointments must be as per the regular recruitment process and rules which will require advertisement for appointments as permanent posts, and much less because in terms of the ratio of the *Umadevi's case (supra)*, the Delhi State Services Selection Board (DSSSB), and who appoints employees for the respondent no.2, has already issued a circular that there should not be appointments to regular posts except in accordance with the law and the process as specified in the regular recruitment rules.”

7. The Supreme Court in the case of *National Fertilizers Ltd. and Others Vs. Somvir Singh (2006) 5 SCC 493* by referring to the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* has held that persons who have been only appointed for temporary periods or are temporary employees in posts,

such persons cannot claim regularization. In *National Fertilizers Ltd.'s case (supra)* the Supreme Court has reproduced the relevant paras of *Umadevi's case (supra)* and the relevant paras of *National Fertilizers Ltd.'s case (supra)* are paras 20,21 and 22 and which paras read as under:-

“20. The Constitution Bench opined that any appointment made in violation of the Recruitment Rules as also in violation of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution would be nullity. The contention raised on behalf of the employees that those temporary or ad hoc employees who had continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities must consider their cases for regularisation was answered, thus: [*Umadevi (3) Case (supra)*, SCC p.29, para 26]

“26. With respect, why should the State be allowed to depart from the normal rule and indulge in temporary employment in permanent posts? This Court, in our view, is bound to insist on the State making regular and proper recruitments and is bound not to encourage or shut its eyes to the persistent transgression of the rules of regular recruitment. The direction to make permanent -- the distinction between regularization and making permanent, was not emphasized here -- can only encourage the State, the model employer, to flout its own rules and would confer undue benefits on a few at the cost of many waiting to compete. With respect, the direction made in paragraph 50 of *State of Haryana v. Piara Singh: (1992) 4 SCC 118* are to some extent inconsistent with the conclusion in paragraph 45 therein. With great respect, it appears to us that the last of the directions clearly runs counter to the constitutional scheme of employment recognized in the earlier part of the decision. Really, it cannot be said that this decision has laid down the law that all ad hoc, temporary or casual employees engaged without following the regular recruitment procedure should be made permanent.”

21. It was furthermore opined: [*Umadevi (3) Case (supra)*, SCC p.32, para 33]

“33. It is not necessary to notice all the decisions of this Court on this aspect. By and large what emerges is that regular recruitment should be insisted upon, only in a contingency an ad hoc appointment can be made in a permanent vacancy, but the same should soon be followed by a regular recruitment and that appointments to non-available posts should not be taken

note of for regularization. The cases directing regularization have mainly proceeded on the basis that having permitted the employee to work for some period, he should be absorbed, without really laying down any law to that effect, after discussing the constitutional scheme for public employment.”

22. Taking note of some recent decisions of this Court, it was held that the State does not enjoy a power to make appointments in terms of Article 162 of the Constitution of India. It further quoted with approval a decision of this Court in *Union Public Service Commission v. Girish Jayanti Lal Vaghela*:(2006) 2 SCC 482 in the following terms: (SCC p. 490, para 12)

“The appointment to any post under the State can only be made after a **proper advertisement** has been made inviting applications from eligible candidates and holding of selection by a body of experts or a specially constituted committee whose members are fair and impartial through a written examination or interview or some other rational criteria for judging the inter se merit of candidates who have applied in response to the advertisement made. A regular appointment to a post under the State or Union cannot be made without **issuing advertisement in the prescribed manner** which may in some cases include inviting applications from the employment exchange where eligible candidates get their names registered. Any regular appointment made on a post under the State or Union without issuing advertisement inviting applications from eligible candidates and without holding a proper selection where all eligible candidates get a fair chance to compete would violate the guarantee enshrined under Article 16 of the Constitution.”

It was clearly held: [*Umadevi (3) case (supra)*, SCC p.35, para 41]

“These binding decisions are clear imperatives that adherence to Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution is a must in the process of public employment.” (emphasis added)

8. A reference to para 22 above in the case of *National Fertilizers Ltd. (supra)* makes it abundantly clear that the advertisement which should be issued for inviting applications from eligible candidates has to be a proper advertisement and an advertisement in the prescribed manner. In my opinion, appropriate advertisement or advertisement in the prescribed manner necessarily means that advertisement issued for seeking appointment is advertisement for employment in permanent tenure and not an advertisement which seeks appointments to temporary

posts or for temporary period in permanent posts or appointments are to be only contractual appointments. Para 22 above in the case of ***National Fertilizers Ltd. (supra)*** specifically notes that regular appointment to a post under the State or Union cannot be made without issuing advertisement in the prescribed manner, and prescribed manner necessarily has to mean that the posts have to be advertised as permanent tenure posts for being filled up, inasmuch as, otherwise multitude of people who would otherwise be eligible to apply, may prefer to skip the employment process thinking that it is only for a temporary period or a contractual period since posts are not for permanent employment. Para 22 above in the case of ***National Fertilizers Ltd. (supra)*** makes it clear that appointments made without issuing requisite advertisement would violate the guarantee under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

9. Supreme Court recently in the judgment in the case of ***Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan and Others Vs. L.V. Subramanyeswara and Another (2007) 5 SCC 326*** has held that if all the eligible candidates are not called by means of the advertisement, then, the process of recruitment will violate the ratio in the case of ***Umadevi (supra)*** as also Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. These observations have been made by the Supreme Court in para 10 of the judgment in the case of ***Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (supra)*** and this para 10 reads as under:-

“10. Had such regular vacancies been created, appellants would have been directed to be appointed on All India Basis. Respondents did not get their names registered in the Central Employment Exchange. Keeping in view the nature of the job and in particular that the posts are transferable throughout the country, an opportunity within the meaning of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India would mean an opportunity to all who are eligible therefore. Advertisement was issued for a limited purpose, namely, for leave vacancies, local employment exchanges were contacted only for filling of such posts and not regular posts.”
(underlining added)

10. Another recent judgment of the Supreme Court and which in a way lays down the same ratio is the judgment in the case of ***State of Orissa and Another Vs. Mamata Mohanty (2011) 3 SCC 436***. In this judgment the Supreme Court has held that candidates who are not duly qualified if are appointed, the same would cause grave and irreparable injury to other unqualified candidates who would have otherwise applied, and therefore in such a case when unqualified persons seek regularization,

that would be violative of the ratio in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* as also Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. The relevant observations of the Supreme Court in the case of *Mamta Mohanty (supra)* are made in para 36 of the judgment, and para 35 also is relevant because the same makes the legal position very clear that the object of issuing advertisement is to ensure open competition by calling of all the eligible candidates. These paras 35 and 36 read as under:-

“35. At one time this Court had been of the view that calling the names from Employment Exchange would curb to certain extent the menace of nepotism and corruption in public employment. But, later on, came to the conclusion that some appropriate method consistent with the requirements of Article 16 should be followed. In other words there must be a notice published in the appropriate manner calling for applications and all those who apply in response thereto should be considered fairly. Even if the names of candidates are requisitioned from Employment Exchange, in addition thereto it is mandatory on the part of the employer to invite applications from all eligible candidates from the open market by advertising the vacancies in newspapers having wide circulation or by announcement in Radio and Television as merely calling the names from the Employment Exchange does not meet the requirement of the said Article of the Constitution. (Vide *Delhi Development Horticulture Employees' Union v. Delhi Admn.*, : AIR 1992 SC 789, *State of Haryana v. Piara Singh* : AIR 1992 SC 2130, *Excise Supdt. v. K.B.N. Visweshwara Rao* : (1996) 6 SCC 216, *Arun Tewari v. Zila Mansavi Shikshak Sangh* : AIR 1998 SC 331, *Binod Kumar Gupta v. Ram Ashray Mahoto* : AIR 2005 SC 2103, *National Fertilizers Ltd. v. Somvir Singh* : AIR 2006 SC 2319, *Telecom District Manager v. Keshab Deb* : (2008) 8 SCC 402, *State of Bihar v. Upendra Narayan Singh* : (2009) 5 SCC 65 and *State of M.P. v. Mohd. Abraham* : (2009) 15 SCC 214.)

36. Therefore, it is a settled legal proposition that no person can be appointed even on a temporary or ad hoc basis without inviting applications from all eligible candidates. If any appointment is made by merely inviting names from the Employment Exchange or putting a note on the Notice Board etc. that will not meet the requirement of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. Such a course violates the mandates of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India as it deprives the candidates who are eligible for the post, from being considered. A

person employed in violation of these provisions is not entitled to any relief including salary. For a valid and legal appointment mandatory compliance of the said Constitutional requirement is to be fulfilled. The equality clause enshrined in Article 16 requires that every such appointment be made by an open advertisement as to enable all eligible persons to compete on merit." (underlining added)

11. In *Umadevi's case (supra)* the only exception which was carved out with respect to regularization of persons was those persons whose appointments were irregular as distinguished from illegal. Such irregular appointees who had worked for 10 years prior to passing of the decision in *Umadevi's case (supra)*, if they had worked in their posts without benefit of court orders, such eligible persons who had been appointed against vacancies in sanctioned posts, the government and governmental organizations were to float schemes to regularize appointments of such irregularly appointed persons on account of the fact that appointments made were only irregular i.e the recruitment process was of filling posts from eligible candidates without means of advertisements in newspapers and/or through the employment exchange. Para 53 of the judgment in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* reads as under:-

"53. One aspect needs to be clarified. There may be cases where irregular appointments (not illegal appointments) as explained in *State of Mysore v. S.V. Narayanappa : AIR 1967 SC 1071*, *R.N. Nanjundappa v. T. Thimmiah : (1972) 1 SCC 409*, and *B.N. Nagarajan v. State of Karnataka : (1979) 4 SCC 507*, and referred to in paragraph 15 above, of duly qualified persons in duly sanctioned vacant posts might have been made and the employees have continued to work for ten years or more but without the intervention of orders of courts or of tribunals. The question of regularization of the services of such employees may have to be considered on merits in the light of the principles settled by this Court in the cases above referred to and in the light of this judgment. In that context, the Union of India, the State Governments and their instrumentalities should take steps to regularize as a one time measure, the services of such irregularly appointed, who have worked for ten years or more in duly sanctioned posts but not under cover of orders of courts or of tribunals and should further ensure that regular recruitments are undertaken to fill those vacant sanctioned posts that require to be filled up, in cases where temporary employees or daily wagers are being now employed. The process must be set in motion within six

months from this date. We also clarify that regularization, if any already made, but not sub judice, need not be reopened based on this judgment, but there should be no further by-passing of the constitutional requirement and regularizing or making permanent, those not duly appointed as per the constitutional scheme.”

(emphasis added)

12. A reference to para 53 above in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* shows that irregular appointments were to be regularized only as a one-time measure. One time measure by its plain and simple language means that only for once at the time of passing of the judgment in *Umadevi's case (supra)* there can be regularization of irregularly appointed employees ie after the decision in *Umadevi's case (supra)*, there cannot be regularization of appointees who are irregularly appointed i.e the appointments may not be illegal and only are irregular in the sense that appointment is not through the means of calling of eligible candidates vide circulations in newspapers for ensuring competition amongst the eligible candidates but even such persons cannot be regularized after the decision in *Umadevi's case (supra)* as even irregular appointments are in violation of recruitment rules and there cannot be violation of recruitment rules post *Umadevi's case (supra)*. Therefore, in my opinion, the ratio of para 53 above of *Umadevi's case (supra)* makes it clear that the issue of regularization of irregularly appointed employees post *Umadevi's case (supra)* is time and again not permissible because that is exactly what the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* prohibits i.e regularization of persons appointed in violation of recruitment rules which will require calling of candidates by proper advertisements through newspapers.

13. I may note that a Division Bench of two judges of the Supreme Court in the case of *U.P. State Electricity Board Vs. Pooran Chandra Pandey and Others (2007) 11 SCC 92* sought to water-down the ratio of the Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *Umadevi (supra)*, and this judgment of a Division Bench of the two Judges of Supreme Court was specifically overruled by a Division Bench of three Judges of the Supreme Court in the case of *Official Liquidator Vs. Dayanand and Others (2008) 10 SCC 1*. In *Dayanand's case (supra)* the Supreme Court has made very strong observations that a Division Bench of two or three judges of the Supreme Court cannot be allowed to water-down the categorical ratio of the Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* and made observations with respect to judicial discipline with respect to Benches of similar number of Judges being bound by the judgments passed by a Bench consisting of similar or larger number of judges. These

observations are contained in paras 75 to 77 and 90 to 92 in *Dayanand's case (supra)* and these paras read as under:-

“75. By virtue of Article 141 of the Constitution, the judgment of the Constitution Bench in *State of Karnataka v. Umadevi* (3) (*supra*) is binding on all the courts including this Court till the same is overruled by a larger Bench. The ratio of the Constitution Bench judgment has been followed by different two-Judges Benches for declining to entertain the claim of regularization of service made by ad hoc/temporary/ daily wage/casual employees or for reversing the orders of the High Court granting relief to such employees - *Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Workmen* : (2007) 1 SCC 408, *Gangadhar Pillai v. Siemens Ltd.* : (2007) 1 SCC 533, *Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan v. L.V. Subramanyeswara* : (2007) 5 SCC 326, *Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd. v. Dan Bahadur Singh* : (2007) 6 SCC 207. However, in *U.P. SEB v. Pooran Chandra Pandey* : (2007) 11 SCC 92 on which reliance has been placed by Shri Gupta, a two-Judges Bench has attempted to dilute the Constitution Bench judgment by suggesting that the said decision cannot be applied to a case where regularization has been sought for in pursuance of Article 14 of the Constitution and that the same is in conflict with the judgment of the seven-Judges Bench in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* : (1978) 1 SCC 248.

76. The facts of *U.P. SEB v. Pooran Chandra Pandey (supra)* were that the respondents (34 in number) were employed as daily wage employees by the Cooperative Electricity Supply Society in 1985. The Society was taken over by Uttar Pradesh Electricity Supply Board in 1997 along with daily wage employees. Earlier to this, the Electricity Board had taken a policy decision on 28-11-1996 to regularize the services of its employees working on daily wages from before 4-5-1990, subject to their passing the examination. The respondents moved the High Court claiming benefit of the policy decision dated 28-11-1996. The learned Single Judge of the High Court held that once the employees of the society became employees of the Electricity Board, there was no valid ground to discriminate them in the matter of regularization of service. The Division Bench approved the order of the Single Bench. A two-Judges Bench of this Court dismissed the appeal of the Electricity Board. In para 11 of its judgment, the two-Judges Bench distinguished *State of Karnataka v. Umadevi* (3) (*supra*) by observing that the ratio of that judgment cannot be applied to a case

where regularization has been sought for in pursuance of Article 14 of the Constitution. The two-Judges Bench then referred to *State of Orissa v. Sudhansu Sekhar Misra* AIR 1968 SC 647, *Ambica Quarry Works v. State of Gujarat* : (1987) 1 SCC 213, *Bhavnagar University v. Palitana Sugar Mill (P) Ltd.* : (2003) 2 SCC 111, *Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd. v. N.R. Vairamani* (2004) 8 SCC 579 and observed: (*Pooran Chandra Pandey case* (*supra*), SCC pp. 98-99, paras 16 & 18)

“16. We are constrained to refer to the above decisions and principles contained therein because we find that often *Umadevi* (3) case (*supra*) is being applied by courts mechanically as if it were a Euclid's formula without seeing the facts of a particular case. As observed by this Court in *Bhavnagar University* (*supra*) and *Bharat Petroleum Corpn. Ltd* (*supra*) a little difference in facts or even one additional fact may make a lot of difference in the precedential value of a decision. Hence, in our opinion, *Umadevi* (3) case (*supra*) cannot be applied mechanically without seeing the facts of a particular case, as a little difference in facts can make *Umadevi* (3) case (*supra*) inapplicable to the facts of that case.

*

*

*

18. We may further point out that a seven-Judge Bench decision of this Court in *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India* (*supra*) has held that reasonableness and non-arbitrariness is part of Article 14 of the Constitution. It follows that the Government must act in a reasonable and non-arbitrary manner otherwise Article 14 of the Constitution would be violated. *Maneka Gandhi case* (*supra*) is a decision of a seven-Judge Bench, whereas *Umadevi* (3) case is a decision of a five-Judge Bench of this Court. It is well settled that a smaller Bench decision cannot override a larger Bench decision of the Court. No doubt, *Maneka Gandhi case* (*supra*) does not specifically deal with the question of regularisation of government employees, but the principle of reasonableness in executive action and the law which it has laid down, in our opinion, is of general application.”

(emphasis supplied)

77. We have carefully analyzed the judgment of the two-Judges Bench (in *Pooran Chandra Pandey case (supra)*) and are of the considered view that the above reproduced observations were not called for. The only issue which fell for consideration by two-Judges Bench was whether the daily wage employees of the society, the establishment of which was taken over by the Electricity Board along with the employees, were entitled to be regularized in terms of the policy decision taken by the Board and whether the High Court committed an error by invoking Article 14 of the Constitution for granting relief to the writ petitioners. The question whether the Electricity Board could frame such a policy was neither raised nor considered by the High Court and this Court. The High Court simply adverted to the facts of the case and held that once the daily wage employees of the society became employees of the Electricity Board, they could not be discriminated in the matter of implementation of the policy of regularization. Therefore, the two-Judges Bench had no occasion to make any adverse comment on the binding character of the Constitution Bench judgment in *State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3) (supra)*.

XXXXXXXXXX

90. We are distressed to note that despite several pronouncements on the subject, there is substantial increase in the number of cases involving violation of the basics of judicial discipline. The learned Single Judges and Benches of the High Courts refuse to follow and accept the verdict and law laid down by coordinate and even larger Benches by citing minor difference in the facts as the ground for doing so. Therefore, it has become necessary to reiterate that disrespect to constitutional ethos and breach of discipline have grave impact on the credibility of judicial institution and encourages chance litigation. It must be remembered that predictability and certainty is an important hallmark of judicial jurisprudence developed in this country in last six decades and increase in the frequency of conflicting judgments of the superior judiciary will do incalculable harm to the system inasmuch as the courts at the grass root will not be able to decide as to which of the judgment lay down the correct law and which one should be followed.

91. We may add that in our constitutional set up every citizen is

under a duty to abide by the Constitution and respect its ideals and institutions. Those who have been entrusted with the task of administering the system and operating various constituents of the State and who take oath to act in accordance with the Constitution and uphold the same, have to set an example by exhibiting total commitment to the Constitutional ideals. This principle is required to be observed with greater rigour by the members of judicial fraternity who have been bestowed with the power to adjudicate upon important constitutional and legal issues and protect and preserve rights of the individuals and society as a whole. Discipline is sine qua non for effective and efficient functioning of the judicial system. If the Courts command others to act in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and rule of law, it is not possible to countenance violation of the constitutional principle by those who are required to lay down the law.

92. In the light of what has been stated above, we deem it proper to clarify that the comments and observations made by the two-Judges Bench in *U.P. SEB v. Pooran Chandra Pandey (supra)* should be read as obiter and the same should neither be treated as binding by the High Courts, Tribunals and other judicial foras nor they should be relied upon or made basis for bypassing the principles laid down by the Constitution Bench.”

(emphasis added)

14. The ethos with respect to the ratio of *Umadevi's case (supra)* stating that the entire object was to prevent the spoils system in public employment which was existing prior to the Constitution Bench judgment in *Umadevi's case (supra)* has been further clarified by the Supreme Court in paras 66 to 68 in *Dayanand's case (supra)* and these paras read as under:-

“66. The judgments of 1980s and early 1990s - *Dhirendra Chamoli v. State of U.P.* : (1986) 1 SCC 637, *Surinder Singh v. CPWD* : (1986) 1 SCC 639, *Daily Rated Casual Labour v. Union of India* : (1988) 1 SCC 122, *Dharwad Distt. P.W.D. Literate Daily Wage Employees' Assn. v. State of Karnataka* (1990) 2 SCC 396, *Bhagwati Prasad v. Delhi State Mineral Development Corpn.* : (1990) 1 SCC 361 and *State of Haryana v. Piara Singh (supra)* are representative of an era when this Court enthusiastically endeavored to expand the meaning of equality clause enshrined in the Constitution and ordained that employees appointed on temporary/ad hoc/daily wage basis should be treated

at par with regular employees in the matter of payment of salaries and allowances and that their services be regularized. In several cases, the schemes framed by the governments and public employer for regularization of temporary/ad- hoc/daily wag/casual employees irrespective of the source and mode of their appointment/ engagement were also approved. In some cases, the courts also directed the State and its instrumentalities/agencies to frame schemes for regularization of the services of such employees.

67. In *State of Haryana v. Piara Singh (supra)*, this Court while reiterating that appointment to the public posts should ordinarily be made by regular recruitment through the prescribed agency and that even where ad-hoc or temporary employment is necessitated on account of the exigencies of administration, the candidate should be drawn from the employment exchange and that if no candidate is available or sponsored with the employment exchange, some method consistent with the requirements of Article 14 of the Constitution should be followed by publishing notice in appropriate manner for calling for applications and all those who apply in response thereto should be considered fairly, proceeded to observe that if an ad-hoc or temporary employee is continued for a fairly long spell, the authorities are duty bound to consider his case for regularization subject to his fulfilling the conditions of eligibility and the requirement of satisfactory service. The propositions laid down in *Piara Singh case (supra)* were followed by almost all High Courts for directing the concerned State Governments and public authorities to regularize the services of ad- hoc/temporary/daily wage employees only on the ground that they have continued for a particular length of time. In some cases, the schemes framed for regularization of the services of the backdoor entrants were also approved.

68. The above noted judgments and orders encouraged the political set up and bureaucracy to violate the soul of Article 14 and 16 as also the provisions contained in the Employment Exchanges (Compulsory Notification of Vacancies) Act, 1959 with impunity and the spoil system which prevailed in the United State of America in sixteenth and seventeenth century got firm foothold in this country. Thousands of persons were employed/engaged throughout the length and breadth of the country by backdoor methods. Those who could pull strings in the power corridors at the higher and lower levels managed to get the cake of public

employment by trampling over the rights of other eligible and more meritorious persons registered with the employment exchanges. A huge illegal employment market developed in different parts of the country and rampant corruption afflicted the whole system. This was recognized by the Court in *Delhi Development Horticulture Employees' Union v. Delhi Admn.* : (1992) 4 SCC 99 in the following words: (SCC pp. 111-12, para 23)

“23. Apart from the fact that the petitioners cannot be directed to be regularised for the reasons given above, we may take note of the pernicious consequences to which the direction for regularisation of workmen on the only ground that they have put in work for 240 or more days, has been leading. Although there is an Employment Exchange Act which requires recruitment on the basis of registration in the Employment Exchange, it has become a common practice to ignore the Employment Exchange and the persons registered in the Employment Exchanges, and to employ and get employed directly those who are either not registered with the Employment Exchange or who though registered are lower in the long waiting list in the Employment Register. The courts can take judicial notice of the fact that such employment is sought and given directly for various illegal considerations including money. The employment is given first for temporary periods with technical breaks to circumvent the relevant rules, and is continued for 240 or more days with a view to give the benefit of regularization knowing the judicial trend that those who have completed 240 or more days are directed to be automatically regularized. A good deal of illegal employment market has developed resulting in a new source of corruption and frustration of those who are waiting at the Employment Exchanges for years. Not all those who gain such backdoor entry in the employment are in need of the particular jobs. Though already employed elsewhere, they join the jobs for better and secured prospects. That is why most of the cases which come to the courts are of employment in government departments, public undertakings or agencies. Ultimately it is the people who bear the heavy burden of the surplus labour. The other equally injurious effect of indiscriminate regularization has been that many of the agencies have stopped undertaking casual or temporary works though they

are urgent and essential for fear that if those who are employed on such works are required to be continued for 240 or more days they have to be absorbed as regular employees although the works are time-bound and there is no need of the workmen beyond the completion of the works undertaken. The public interests are thus jeopardised on both counts.” ”

15. It is therefore clear that the ratio of the judgment in the case of *Umadevi (supra)* really prevents regularization of persons who have been appointed pursuant to such an advertisement and which advertisement itself required employment only for a limited period, and therefore such persons who have been appointed for a limited period in terms of the advertisement requiring their appointments for limited periods, cannot seek regularization.”

10. Once the Supreme Court has categorically in the case of *Official Liquidator (supra)* held that contractual appointees who were appointed in terms of advertisement only for contractual period, it is this ratio of the judgment of the Supreme Court which binds this Court and not the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court in L.P.A. No. 161/2015 on 24.03.2015.

11. I have made all the aforesaid observations because the writ petition on merits is bound to be dismissed inasmuch as there exists no legal basis or legal cause of action for the petitioner to claim regularization, but the petitioner wanted this Court to allow withdrawal of the writ petition with liberty to file writ petition seeking the same relief of regularization. Petitioner for the present has no threat of termination of his services in view of the circular dated 16.2.2015 of the Government of NCT of Delhi

which prohibits termination of services of contractual appointees. This Court has no difficulty in allowing the simplicitor withdrawal of the writ petition in view of the circular of the Government of NCT of Delhi dated 16.02.2015 which has already been reproduced by the Division Bench in the order dated 24.03.2015 passed in LPA No.161/2015, but, liberty which is sought for by the petitioner for filing a fresh petition can only be granted in accordance with law and since law does not permit by filing of a petition by contractual persons to seek regularization of their posts the liberty to file a fresh petition for regularization of petitioner who is a contractual appointee cannot be granted.

12. In view of the above, though the petitioner is allowed to withdraw the petition in terms of the statement made of his counsel that the circular of Government of NCT of Delhi dated 16.02.2015 which protects his service, however liberty prayed for filing of fresh petition to seek regularization although petitioner is appointed only to contractual post, cannot be granted, as claim to this relief is legally impermissible. The petitioner is accordingly granted liberty to withdraw the writ petition in view of the circular dated 16.02.2015 but without liberty to file a fresh petition seeking regularization.

W.P.(C) 8194/2014 & CM APPL.19071/2014
W.P.(C) 8209/2014 & CM APPL.19092/2014
W.P.(C) 8210/2014 & CM APPL.19094/2014

W.P.(C) 8211/2014 & CM APPL.19096/2014
W.P.(C) 8473/2014 & CM APPL.19607/2014
W.P.(C) 9392/2014 & CM APPL.21226/2014
W.P.(C) 7936/2014 & CM APPL.18613/2014
W.P.(C) 8824/2014 & CM APPL.20256/2014
W.P.(C) 8458/2014 & CM APPL.19569/2014

13. These writ petitions will also stand dismissed as withdrawn as prayed in terms of the circular of the Government of NCT of Delhi dated 16.02.2015 but without any liberty to file the fresh petitions seeking regularization as similarly held in W.P.(C) No. 7942/2014.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

MAY 26, 2015
DK