

\$~37

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 8685/2017, CM Nos. 35654-35655/2017**
SHRI BRIJESH KUMAR YADAV AND ORS.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dinesh Garg, Adv. with Mr.
Parimal Kumar, adv.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) AND ORS.

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Sakshi Popli, Adv. with Ms.
Pritika, Adv. for R-1
Mr. Sanjoy Ghosh, Adv. for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER
% **26.09.2017**

CM Nos. 35654/2017

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8685/2017

1. The present petition has been filed with the following prayers:-

“It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that in the light of above facts and circumstances, your Lordship may kindly be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus thereby directing the Board of Management (BOM) of Indira Gandhi Deli Technical University for women (IGDTUW) to regularize the above said petitioners on the ground of parity with other two contractual

employees who have been regularized by the said university i.e the respondent No.2 and as per policy of the GGSIP University in the interest of justice.”

2. It is noted that as on date, the petitioners are working with the respondent No.2. It is their case in the writ petition that on two occasions, the respondent No.2 had, with an intention to regularize the services of the petitioners, considered the aspect whether the petitioners fulfil the criteria for regularization as per the Recruitment Rules. Despite such a procedure having gone through, the respondent No.2 has not regularized their services.

3. Mr. Sanjoy Ghosh, who appears for respondent No.2 states, that the aspect of regularization of the petitioners shall be considered by the respondent No.2 by treating the writ petition as a representation. This suggestion of Mr. Ghosh is acceptable to the learned counsel for the petitioner. The petition is disposed of directing the respondent No.2 to consider the regularization of the petitioners as MTS/Peon/Gardeners within eight weeks from the receipt of copy of this order by passing reasoned orders. I have been informed that the engagement of the petitioners shall expire on September 30, 2017. As this Court has directed the respondent No.2 to consider the writ petition as a representation and pass reasoned orders, I deem it fit to direct the respondents to continue the engagement of

the petitioners till a decision is taken in terms of this order.

4. This Court has not expressed any view on the merit of the issue, raised in this petition. If the decision of the respondent No.2 is against the petitioners, they shall be at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

CM No. 35655/2017 (for direction)

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2017/ak