

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 8324 of 2018**

Shiv Kumar Yadav S/o Shri Tijau Ram Yadav, Aged About 43 Years,
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Working Under The Indira
Gandhi Krishi Vishvavidhyalay, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur
Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Agricultural Department,
Mahanadi Bhawan, New Mantralaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Vice Chancellor, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishvavidhyalay,
Labhandi, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Dean/Presiding Officer, TCB College Of Agriculture And
Research Station, Sarkanda, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioners	:	Shri Palash Tiwari, Advocate.
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, P.L.
For University	:	Shri D. N. Prajapati, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

14/12/2018

1. The claim of the petitioner in the present writ petition is for a direction to the respondents to consider his case for regularization.
2. Contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has been working with the respondents as daily wage employee continuously since 1997 and as such he has been put in service for more than 21 years with the respondents. He submits that the petitioner has worked for more than 21 years with the respondents itself shows that there was availability of work and post with the

respondents and therefore the respondents ought to have considered the petitioner for regularization. It has been pointed out by the counsel for the petitioner that identically placed persons have already been considered by the respondents for regularization and group of persons were regularized as early as on 15.09.2008. It is further contended that the order of regularization of similarly placed persons dated 15.09.2008 was in accordance with the circular of the State Govt. dated 05.03.2008. It was lastly contended that even the case of the petitioner was duly considered by the respondents and his case for regularization was referred to the higher authorities in the department but no final order has been passed regularizing the services of the petitioner.

3. Keeping in view the aforesaid contentions of the counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would serve in admitting the petition and keeping it pending for long. Rather ends of justice would meet if the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents 2 & 3 to consider the case of the petitioner also in the light of the observations and contentions made by the petitioner in the preceding paragraph and an appropriate order be passed within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

**(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**