

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No.849 of 2016

- Gabriyal Ram S/o Nirmal Ram, Aged About 46 Years R/o Village Gutri, Post Sitoga, Tahsil Jashpur Nagar (Chhattisgarh), Posted As A Watchman At P.W.D. Circuit House Gamhariya, Jashpur Nagar, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Engineer In Chief, Department Of Public Works, Sirpur Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Executive Engineer (B/ R), Public Works Department, Division, Jashpur, District Jashpur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Sub Divisional Officer (P W D), (B/ R), Sub Division No.1, Jashpur, District Jashpur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri B. P. Singh, Advocate
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Manish Nigam, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

21/08/2017

Heard.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is working as Chowkidar (as a daily wager) in the office of Public Works Department, Jashpur since 01-09-1992 against the regular sanctioned vacant post. The Executive Engineer, Superintending Engineer and the Chief Engineer have recommended his name for regularization but the same is not being considered by respondent No.2, and therefore, this petition may be disposed off directing the respondent No.2 to consider and decide the petitioner's case for regularization strictly in terms of Circular dated 05-03-2008, for this, learned State counsel submits that if the petitioner files a fresh representation, the

same shall be considered by the respondent No.2 in accordance with law.

3. In view of above, this petition is disposed off. However, if the petitioner files a fresh representation along with copy of this order within a period of one month from today, the respondent No.2 shall consider and decide the representation in the light of Circular dated 05-03-2008 subject to verification of the facts, as early as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of representation.

4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the respondent authority may decide the representation on its own merits.

SD/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge