

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 8000 of 2018**

- Rajmal Sona S/o Balman Sona, Aged About 38 Years, Working as Daily Wage/ Contingency Sweeper at P.S. Sakti, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Secretary, Home Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Director General of Police, Police Head Quarters, Sector 19 Atal Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Inspector General of Police (Administration), Police Head Quarters, Sector 19 Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
5. Assistant Inspector General of Police, (Scheme/Management) Police Head Quarters, Sector 19 Atal Nagar, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. Superintendent of Police, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Smt. Naushina Ali and Syed Ishhadil Ali, Advocates
For State	:	Shri Chandresh Shrivastava, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****05.12.2018**

1. The claim of the petitioner is for a direction to the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization as they have taken more than 20 years of service with the department by now.

2. According to the petitioner, the claim of the petitioner be considered in the light of the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***State of Karnataka and Others Vs. Umadevi (3) and Others, (2006) 4 SCC 1*** as also the circular of the State Government dated 05.03.2008.

3. Considering the total facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the length of service that the petitioner has put, let the authorities concerned consider the case of the petitioner so far as their claim for regularization in accordance with the policy and circular of the State Government dealing with regularization. Let a decision be taken by the respondents within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion so far as the entitlement of the petitioner is concerned.

4. With the aforesaid directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge