

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 8545 of 2018

Khem Lal Sahu S/o Shri Dhiraji Ram Sahu Aged About 53 Years R/o Village House No. 164 Ward No. 8 Sath Para, Rengadabari, Tahsil Doundi Lohara , District- Balod, Chhattisgarh., District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Forest, Mahanandi Bhawan,mantralaya,atal Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Principal Chief Conservator Of Forest Head Quarter Jail Road Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Conservator Of Forest Durg Circle Durg, District- Durg, Chhattisgarh., District : Durg, Chhattisgarh
4. Divisional Forest Officer Balod District Balod, Chhattisgarh., District : Balod, Chhattisgarh
5. Divisional Forest Officer Forest Division Balod/chairman Scrutiny Committee Balod, District- Balod, Chhattisgarh., District : Balod, Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For petitioner	:	Shri F. S. Khare, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Jitendra Pali, Dy. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

07/01/2019

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order Annexure P/1 dated 06.10.2008, whereby the claim of the petitioner for regularization has been rejected.
2. The rejection was on the ground that the petitioner has not worked continuously between the period 01.01.1991 to 28.02.2000 and there was a very short period of employment rendered by the petitioner as a daily wage employee and therefore he would not be entitled for the benefits arising out of the circular dated 05.03.2008.
3. Perusal of the record would show that the petitioner had been initially working as a daily wage employee as a Chowkidar with the respondents from 01.01.1991 to 28.02.2000. In March, 2000 the services of the petitioner stood discontinued.

4. The petitioner immediately raised a dispute before the Conciliation officer and the matter was referred to the Labour Court, Rajnandgaon vide case No. 14/I.D.Act/Reference/2000. The Labour Court vide its award dated 09.12.2009 held the discontinuance of the services of the petitioner from March, 2000 to be bad in law and accordingly ordered for reinstatement in service without back wages.

5. Perusal of the finding of the Labour Court would also reveal that before the Labour Court there has been a positive evidence led by the petitioner that he has been continuously working with the department since 1991 to March, 2000. There were also certain documents in support of his contentions that he has produced before the Labour Court. The contention of the petitioner was not sufficiently rebutted by the respondents and the Labour Court finally vide its award reached to the conclusion that the petitioner has worked between 1991 to 2000 and the discontinuance was in non-compliance of the mandatory requirement under the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act and held the discontinuance to be bad.

6. What is also relevant is that the award of the Labour Court dated 09.12.2009 has not been challenged by the respondents and in due course, the same has attained its finality. The award of the Labour Court has also been complied with in as much as the petitioner has been reinstated in service on 06.04.2010 and he continues to work with the department since then. Thus, the petitioner in accordance with the findings of the Labour Court has to be presumed to be in continuous employment right from 1991 onwards.

7. The said view stands fortified by the judgment of this Court in the case of **“Tukaram v. State of Chhattisgarh” WPS No. 1703/2015**, decided on 16.05.2017. Once when there is a categorical finding of the Labour Court, the authorities in the department cannot, unless the award is set-aside, sit over the finding of the Labour Court and take a different view. Once when there is an order of holding the petitioner to be in continuous employment from 1991 onwards, the authorities have to presume the fact that the petitioner is in continuous employment from 1991 onward. Thus, this Court has no hesitation in holding that

the finding of the authority while rejecting the claim for regularization of the petitioner to be bad in law.

8. Given the said facts, the impugned order Annexure P/1 dated 06.10.2018 is held to be bad in law, arbitrary and deserves to be and is accordingly set-aside.

9. It is directed that the respondents shall reconsider the case of the petitioner for regularization in the light of the award of the Labour Court dated 09.12.2009 as also the order of the Division Bench of this High Court in the case of **“Tukaram”** (supra) and pass a fresh order strictly in accordance with the observations made in the preceding paragraphs within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

10. The writ petition accordingly stands allowed and disposed off.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

Rohit