

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.27717 of 2022

Ganesh Chandra Rout

Petitioner
Mr. P.K. Barik, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and others

Opp. Parties
Mr. T.K. Pattanaik, A.S.C.

CORAM:

JUSTICE A.K. MOHAPATRA

ORDER

10.11.2022

Order No.

- 01.
1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical Mode).
 2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the State. Perused the record.
 3. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:

“The petitioner therefore, prays that this Hon’ble Court may be graciously pleased to admit this Writ application and issue Rule NISI, to the Opposite Parties, calling upon them to Show case;

I) Why the Opposite Parties will not be directed to regularize the services of the petitioner with effect from 01.03.2009, within a stipulated time and give the pensionary benefits and other consequential service benefits as due and admissible, on such regularization of service;

AND if the Opposite Parties, failed to Show Cause or show insufficient cause, the said Rule may be made absolute, by issuing appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions as would be deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances.”
 4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that although

the petitioner has filed representation dated 06.04.2021 under Annexure-8 before the Executive Engineer, Baisinga Canal Division, Subernarekha Irrigation Project, Laxmiposhi, Baripada, Mayurbhanj- Opposite Party No.4, the same is still pending before the said Opposite party and the said Opposite Party has not taken any decision as of now.

5. Learned counsel for the State submits that if the petitioner approaches by filing a representation before the authorities, he has no objection if a direction is given to the authorities to consider the grievance of the petitioner in accordance with law within a stipulated period of time.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has been continuing as N.M.R. basis under the opposite parties, but till date he has not been regularized, although more than 26 years have passed in the meantime. He has referred to the case of ***State of Karnataka v. Umadevi, 2006(4) SCC 1***, wherein in paragraph 53, the apex Court has held that the State Governments and their instrumentalities should take steps to regularize as a one-time measure the services of such irregularly appointed who have worked for ten years or more in duly sanctioned posts. Similar view has also been taken by the apex Court in ***State of Karnataka and others v. M.L.Keshari and others, 2010(II) OLR (SC) 982***, wherein in paragraph 7 the apex Court has held as follows :

“7. It is evident from the above that there is an exception to the general principles against ‘regularization’ enunciated in Umadevi if the following conditions are fulfilled: (i) The employee concerned should have worked for 10 years or more in duly sanctioned post without the benefit or protection of the interim order of any court or tribunal. In other words, the State Government or its instrumentality should have employed the employee and continued him in service voluntarily and continuously for more than ten years. (ii) The appointment of such employee should not be

illegal even if irregular. Where the appointments are not made or continued against sanctioned posts or where the persons appointed do not possess the prescribed minimum qualifications, the appointments will be considered to be illegal. But where the person employed possessed the prescribed qualifications and was working against sanctioned posts, but had been selected without undergoing the process of open competitive selection, such appointments are considered to be irregular.”

7. In that view of the matter, since the petitioner is continuing as NMR basis and completed 26 years of service in the meantime, as contended by him, and even though his appointment is irregular, this writ petition is disposed of directing the opposite parties to examine the same and take a decision on the regularization of the petitioner keeping in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in *Umadevi and M.L.Keshari* (supra), as well as *Amarkanti Rai v. State of Bihar and others*, (2015) 8 SCC 265, within a period of two months from the date of passing of this order. It is needless to mention here that the representation of the petitioner shall be considered and disposed of by passing a speaking and reasoned order. Any decision so taken on the said representation shall be communicated to the petitioner within a period of two weeks thereafter.

8. With the aforesaid observation/direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Urgent certified copy of this order be granted on proper application.