

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3433 of 2018

Suritram S/o Fagulal Marar Aged About 52 Years R/o Village And Post
Hatoud Tahsil Kasdole , District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.,
District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh ---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Water Resources Department,
Mantralaya , Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur District Raipur
Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Engineer, Mahanadi Pariyojna , Water Resources Department
Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Sub Divisional Officer , Balamdehi And Kantra Survey Sub Division
Kasdole , District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh., District :
Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh ---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. K.P. Sahu, Advocate
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Satish Gupta, G.A.

S.B.:Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

01/05/2018

Heard.

1. The petitioner was engaged as daily wage employee in the year 1985 in the Department. He was retrenched from service in the year 1994 which was challenged by filing an application before the Labour Court. An order of reinstatement passed by the Industrial Court in appeal on 12.06.2006. The petitioner was reinstated in service.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that his case for regularization has not been considered, till date in the light of circular dated 05.03.2008 passed by the State Government, taking into consideration the entire period during which he remained out of employment.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would argue that the petitioner is entitled to count entire period of service during which he remained out of employment, consequent upon his reinstatement pursuant to award passed by

the Labour Court, in view of authoritative pronouncement of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of WPS No.1703 of 2015 (Tukaram Vs. State of Chhattisgarh) and batch of petitions decided on 16.05.2017.

4. Learned counsel for the State would submit that though there is no quarrel with the legal proposition as settled by this Court in the case referred to above, the petitioner's case would require proper scrutiny upon verification of facts.

5. Considering the submission of learned counsel for the parties and taking note of the fact that till date no decision has been taken in the case of the petitioner in the matter of his claim for regularization under circular dated 05.03.2008, the petition at this stage is disposed off with the direction to respondent to examine the petitioner's claim for regularization in accordance with the terms and conditions of circular dated 05.03.2008. While so considering case of the petitioner, the period during which the petitioner remained out of employment shall also be taken into account. That is to say, the petitioner shall be deemed to have continued in service from the initial date of appointment till date.

6. Appropriate Scrutiny Committee should complete the exercise within the period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The Chief Conservator of Forest shall issue necessary direction also for expeditious disposal of the case of the petitioner in accordance with the direction which is now being issued to the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge