IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P(S). No. 3138 of 2024

Naresh Kumar Sinha, son of Late Birendra Prasad, aged about 50 years, resident of Village Kayasthpada, P.O-Jamtara, P.S. Jamtara, District Jamtara

.....Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O and P.S Jagarnathpur, District Ranchi
3. The Commissioner, Mahatama Gandhi Rural Employment Guarantee Adhiniyam (MNGREGA), having its office at Project Bhawan, Dhurwa P.O and P.S Jagarnathpur, District Ranchi
4. The Deputy Commissioner, P.O+P.S Jamtara, District Jamtara
5. The Block Development Officer, Jamtara, PO+P.S Jamtara, District Jamtara.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioners : Mr. Arpit Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. Amitesh Kumar Geasen, AC to AAG-IA
: Mr. Ruchi Mukti, AC to AAG-IA

04/ Dated: 06.05.2026

1. The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioner, praying therein for quashing and setting aside the reasoned order as contained in Memo No. 163 dated 15.02.2024 passed by the 4th Respondent; whereby the claim of the petitioner for regularization/absorption on the post of Gram Rojgar Sewak, has been rejected.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after passing of the reasoned order; several cases with regard to regularization has been decided by the Hon'ble Apex Court, as such, his case should also be considered by the concerned respondent, keeping in mind the latest judgment rendered in the case of ***2024 SCC OnLine SC***

3826 (Jaggo v. UOI) and also in the case of ***Bhola Nath v. State of Jharkhand rendered in 2026 SCC OnLine SC 129.***

3. Relying upon the aforesaid judgment, learned counsel further submits that the instant writ application may be disposed of, by directing the respondents to re-consider the case of the petitioner in light of the latest judgments rendered on the issue, and while taking decision and revisiting with the order, there shall not be prejudice by the impugned order.
4. So far as, this prayer of the petitioner is concerned; there is not much objection. Ld. counsel for the respondent submits that though the reasoned order is not illegal; however, if the petitioner so chooses, he may approach the concerned respondent for reconsideration of the grievance.
5. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstance, the instant writ application is hereby disposed of by directing the respondent no.4 to re-consider the case of the petitioner in light of the judgments referred herein above.
6. In this regard the petitioner shall file a fresh representation before the respondent no. 4 along with the judgments referred herein above, and the concerned respondent shall take decision in light of the decision passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above mentioned cases.
7. It is made clear that while revisiting the reasoned order, he shall not be prejudiced by the previous order and shall pass an order strictly in compliance with the applicable rules and regulations, coupled with the judgments relied upon.
8. For statistical purpose, the impugned order is quashed.
9. The respondent No. 4 shall pass a fresh order, within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of representation.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

Abha/-

06.05.2026