

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 6049 of 2018

Khorbahrin Bai @ Dashmat Bai, D/o Ghadiram Raut, Aged About 57 Years, Occupation- Daily Wage Employee, P.W.D. (B/R) Khairagarh, R/o- Gram Sonesarar, Tahsil Khairagarh, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through- Principle Secretary, P.W.D. Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Engineer In Chief, Department Of P.W.D. Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Executive Engineer P.W.D. (B/R) Khairagarh, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, P.W.D. (B/R) Khairagarh, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For petitioner	:	Shri Sushil Dubey, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

14/09/2018

1. Ignoring the default pointed out by the registry for a moment, the present Writ Petition with the consent of the parties is heard finally and disposed off at motion stage itself.
2. In the instant Writ Petition, the petitioner initially engaged by the respondents in the year 1979 and since then she has been working continuously with the respondents. Meanwhile, there was a dispute so far as her date of birth is concerned in which the petitioner has been able to obtain an order in her favour by the Labour Court, Rajnandgaon. Thereafter the

petitioner has been permitted to continue till the age of superannuation as per the corrected date of birth.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that, the respondents in spite of the fact that the petitioner is entitled for regularization have not considered her claim in accordance with the circular dated 05/03/2008.

4. The counsel for the petitioner makes a limited prayer that the petition may be disposed off with a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner at the earliest.

5. The said limited prayer is not opposed by the State counsel. However he put a rider that the matter may be subject to verification by the respondent authorities.

6. In the given facts, this Court does not intend to keep the Writ Petition pending, rather ends of justice would meet if the Writ Petition is disposed off with a direction to the respondents No. 2 & 3 to take a decision in the case of the petitioner and consider whether she is entitled for regularization in accordance with the circular dated 05/03/2008 or not and pass an appropriate order within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

7. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE