

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1818 of 2025

-
1. Lalbihari Yadav, (Male), aged about-36 years, S/o- Bhuneshwar Yadav, Resident of Village- Turibujurg, Gaya, P.S.-Magadh University, District- Gaya.
 2. Hriday Kumar, (Male), aged about-36 years, S/o- Ramdev Yadav, Resident of Village- Turibujurg, Gaya, P.S.-Magadh University, District- Gaya.
 3. Ramvriksh Manjhi, (Male), aged about-44 years, S/o- Rohan Manjhi, Resident of Village- Rampur, Gaya, P.S.- Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director, Higher Education, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
4. The Magadh University, Bodh Gaya through its Registrar.
5. The Vice Chancellor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
6. The Registrar, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
7. The Finance Officer, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate
For the M.U.	:	Mr. Sriram Krishna, Advocate
		Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Shashank Shekhar Kunwar, Advocate
		Mrs. Rashmi Ranjan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (18)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 06-02-2025

Heard Mr. Ritesh Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners; Mr. Sriram Krishna, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Magadh University and learned SC-18 appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners in paragraph no. 1 of the present



writ petition have sought *inter alia* following relief(s), which is reproduced hereinafter:

"I) For commanding the Respondents to Regularise the services of the petitioner's on their respective Posts, since the Petitioner's are uninterruptedly working in the services of the Magadh University from the date of their appointment i.e. on 22.06.2007 on daily wage basis and are performing the duties which are Perennial in nature and are Indispensable.

II) For commanding the respondents to grant consequential reliefs to the petitioner's after their Regularisation, since the Petitioner's are working as daily wagers in the services of the Magadh University for 17 long years and no complaint whatsoever has been made against the petitioners from any authority, till date and persons appointed on daily wages in 2009 i.e. after the appointment of the petitioners, have already been regularised in the services of the University in 2018, but the Petitioners have been left out for the reasons best known to the Respondent authorities.

III) For grant of any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner may be found entitled for."

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that petitioners have filed detailed representations before the Vice-Chancellor of the Magadh University for regularization of their services on 02.01.2025, however, no action has been taken till date on the said representations.

4. Considering the relief sought for in the present writ petition, as well as, submission made on behalf of the petitioners, I find it proper to direct the Vice-Chancellor of the Magadh University to verify, as to whether, the petitioners were



engaged/appointed on the sanctioned vacant post and, thereafter, take necessary steps and consider the representations of the petitioners in light of the recent law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Jaggo Vs. Union of India & Ors. (SLP (C) No. 5580 of 2024)**, wherein the Apex Court relying on its judgment passed in **Vinod Kumar and Ors. Etc. Vs. Union of India & Ors.**, reported in **(2024) 1 S.C.R. 1230** has made following observations in Paragraph Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23, 25 and 27, which are reproduced hereinafter:

“20. It is well established that the decision in Uma Devi (supra) does not intend to penalize employees who have rendered long years of service fulfilling ongoing and necessary functions of the State or its instrumentalities. The said judgment sought to prevent backdoor entries and illegal appointments that circumvent constitutional requirements. However, where appointments were not illegal but possibly “irregular,” and where employees had served continuously against the backdrop of sanctioned functions for a considerable period, the need for a fair and humane resolution becomes paramount. Prolonged, continuous, and unblemished service performing tasks inherently required on a regular basis can, over the time, transform what was initially ad-hoc or temporary into a scenario demanding fair regularization. In a recent judgement of this Court in Vinod Kumar and Ors. Etc. Vs. Union of India & Ors.[2024] 1 S.C.R. 1230, it was held that procedural formalities cannot be used to deny regularization of service to an employee whose appointment was termed “temporary” but has performed the same duties as performed by the regular employee over a considerable period in the capacity of the regular employee. The relevant paras of this judgment have been reproduced below:

“6. The application of the judgment in Uma Devi (supra) by the High Court does not fit squarely with the facts at hand, given the specific circumstances under which the appellants were



employed and have continued their service. The reliance on procedural formalities at the outset cannot be used to perpetually deny substantive rights that have accrued over a considerable period through continuous service. Their promotion was based on a specific notification for vacancies and a subsequent circular, followed by a selection process involving written tests and interviews, which distinguishes their case from the appointments through back door entry as discussed in the case of Uma Devi (supra).

7. The judgement in the case Uma Devi (supra) also distinguished between “irregular” and “illegal” appointments underscoring the importance of considering certain appointments even if were not made strictly in accordance with the prescribed Rules and Procedure, cannot be said to have been made illegally if they had followed the procedures of regular appointments such as conduct of written examinations or interviews as in the present case... ”

21. The High Court placed undue emphasis on the initial label of the appellants’ engagements and the outsourcing decision taken after their dismissal. Courts must look beyond the surface labels and consider the realities of employment: continuous, long-term service, indispensable duties, and absence of any mala fide or illegalities in their appointments. In that light, refusing regularization simply because their original terms did not explicitly state so, or because an outsourcing policy was belatedly introduced, would be contrary to principles of fairness and equity.

22. The pervasive misuse of temporary employment contracts, as exemplified in this case, reflects a broader systemic issue that adversely affects workers’ rights and job security. In the private sector, the rise of the gig economy has led to an increase in precarious employment arrangements, often characterized by lack of benefits, job security, and fair treatment. Such practices have been criticized for exploiting workers and undermining labour standards. Government institutions, entrusted with upholding the principles of fairness and justice, bear an even greater responsibility to avoid such exploitative employment practices. When public sector entities engage in misuse of temporary contracts, it not only mirrors the detrimental trends observed in the gig economy but also sets a concerning precedent that can erode public trust in governmental operations.

23. The International Labour



Organization (ILO), of which India is a founding member, has consistently advocated for employment stability and the fair treatment of workers. The ILO's Multinational Enterprises Declaration encourages companies to provide stable employment and to observe obligations concerning employment stability and social security. It emphasizes that enterprises should assume a leading role in promoting employment security, particularly in contexts where job discontinuation could exacerbate long-term unemployment.

25. It is a disconcerting reality that temporary employees, particularly in government institutions, often face multifaceted forms of exploitation. While the foundational purpose of temporary contracts may have been to address short-term or seasonal needs, they have increasingly become a mechanism to evade long-term obligations owed to employees. These practices manifest in several ways:

- Misuse of "Temporary" Labels:***

Employees engaged for work that is essential, recurring, and integral to the functioning of an institution are often labeled as "temporary" or "contractual, even when their roles mirror those of regular employees. Such misclassification deprives workers of the dignity, security, and benefits that regular employees are entitled to, despite performing identical tasks.

- Arbitrary Termination:***

Temporary employees are frequently dismissed without cause or notice, as seen in the present case. This practice undermines the principles of natural justice and subjects workers to a state of constant insecurity, regardless of the quality or duration of their service.

- Lack of Career Progression:***

Temporary employees often find themselves excluded from opportunities for skill development, promotions, or incremental pay raises. They remain stagnant in their roles, creating a systemic disparity between them and their regular counterparts, despite their contributions being equally significant.

- Using Outsourcing as a Shield:***

Institutions increasingly resort to outsourcing roles performed by temporary employees, effectively replacing one set of exploited workers with another. This practice not only perpetuates exploitation but also demonstrates a deliberate effort to bypass the obligation to offer regular employment.

- Denial of Basic Rights and Benefits:***

Temporary employees are often denied fundamental benefits such as pension, provident fund, health



insurance, and paid leave, even when their tenure spans decades. This lack of social security subjects them and their families to undue hardship, especially in cases of illness, retirement, or unforeseen circumstances.

27. In light of these considerations, in our opinion, it is imperative for government departments to lead by example in providing fair and stable employment. Engaging workers on a temporary basis for extended periods, especially when their roles are integral to the organization's functioning, not only contravenes international labour standards but also exposes the organization to legal challenges and undermines employee morale. By ensuring fair employment practices, government institutions can reduce the burden of unnecessary litigation, promote job security, and uphold the principles of justice and fairness that they are meant to embody. This approach aligns with international standards and sets a positive precedent for the private sector to follow, thereby contributing to the overall betterment of labour practices in the country."

5. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recently reiterated the same in the case of ***Shripal & Anr. vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad (Civil Appeal Nos. 8158-8179 of 2024)***, wherein, in paragraphs no. 14 and 15, the Apex Court has held as follows:

"14. The Respondent Employer places reliance on Umadevi (supra) to contend that daily-wage or temporary employees cannot claim permanent absorption in the absence of statutory rules providing such absorption. However, as frequently reiterated, Uma Devi itself distinguishes between appointments that are "illegal" and those that are "irregular," the latter being eligible for regularization if they meet certain conditions. More importantly, Uma Devi cannot serve as a shield to justify exploitative engagements persisting for years without the Employer undertaking legitimate recruitment. Given the record which shows no true contractor-based arrangement and a consistent need for permanent horticultural staff the alleged



asserted ban on fresh recruitment, though real, cannot justify indefinite daily-wage status or continued unfair practices.

15. It is manifest that the Appellant Workmen continuously rendered their services over several years, sometimes spanning more than a decade. Even if certain muster rolls were not produced in full, the Employer’s failure to furnish such records—despite directions to do so—allows an adverse inference under well-established labour jurisprudence. Indian labour law strongly disfavors perpetual daily-wage or contractual engagements in circumstances where the work is permanent in nature. Morally and legally, workers who fulfil ongoing municipal requirements year after year cannot be dismissed summarily as dispensable, particularly in the absence of a genuine contractor agreement. At this juncture, it would be appropriate to recall the broader critique of indefinite “temporary” employment practices as done by a recent judgement of this court in Jaggo v. Union of India."

6. With the above observation/direction, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

7. There shall be no order as to cost.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	13.02.2025
Transmission Date	N/A

