

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 3675 of 2017

Smt. Ashrita Lal W/o Shri Akash Lal, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Bruks Compound, Jarhagaon, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner

**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Urban Administration Department And Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Mission Director, National Urban Livelihood Mission N L U M, Office Of State Urban Development Agency, S U D A, 4th Floor, Indravati Bhavan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Dy. Chief Executive Officer, Finance And Administration, National Urban Livelihood Mission N U L M, O/o State Urban Development Authority S U D A, 4th Floor, Indrawati Bhawan, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Project Officer/ Chief Municipal Officer, Mungeli, Municipality Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.
5. Mission Manager, Deendayal Antyoday Yojna, National Urban Livelihood Mission N U L M, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

---

|                 |   |                                |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For petitioner  | : | Shri Somkant Verma, Advocate.  |
| For resp.No.2&3 | : | Shri Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate. |
| For State       | : | Shri Syed Majid Ali, Dy.G.A.   |

---

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

26/10/2018

1. The defaults pointed out by the registry stands ignored/over-ruled for the moment.
2. With the consent of learned counsel appearing for the parties, the writ petition is being disposed off.

3. Present Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking issuance of direction for consideration of her claim for regularization, on the submission that the petitioner is continuing to work in the Mission for last 10 to 25 years without any break in service and it is submitted that exploitative terms and conditions of service are against the spirit of public employment. Further submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that though at the Mission level, recommendations have been prepared and sent to the State Government, the matter has remained pending without any decision.
4. The petitioner appear to be working since long ranging from 10 to 25 years. Therefore, this is an appropriate case where the State and other respondents in coordination should examine the whole matter and consider the petitioner's claim for regularization taking into considering the existing scheme of regularization prevalent in the State. The decision should be taken within a period of 8 weeks.
5. In case petitioner's grievance is not redressed, she will be at liberty to revive the petition.
6. The petition is accordingly disposed off.

Sd/-

**(P. Sam Koshy)**  
**JUDGE**