IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 1926 of 2022

.....

1. Lal Bidya Binay Nath Sahdeo, aged about 56 years. S/o Radhey Shyam Sahdeo, R/o Village Hensapiri, PO Hensapiri, PS Bagru, District Lohardaga, Jharkhand, 835302.
2. Bikas Chandra Das, aged about 59 years, S/o late Diwakar Das, R/o Village Thakur Toli, PO & PS Simdega, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 835222.
3.Deo Nandan Nath Mishra, aged about 60 years, S/o Kailash Nath, Mishra, R/o Village Bijulia, PO Bijulia, PS Ratu, District Ranchi, Jharkhand, 835224.
4.Dhaneshwar Ram Gope, aged about 58 years, S/o late Chandra Gope, PO & PS Sisai, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 835224.
5.Hari Shankar Thakur, aged about 61 years, S/o late Dukhi Thakur, R/o Village Madgadi, PO Kanjia, PS Bhandra, District Garhwa, Jharkhand, 822125.
6.Chuni Lal Pan, aged about 61 years, S/o late Surendra Pan, R/o Village Narsanda, PO & PS Mufassil, District West Singhbhum, Jharkhand, 833201.
7. Narendra Prasad, aged about 56 years, S/o late Anant Sahu, R/o Village Ara Chakme, PO & PS Burmu, District Ranchi, Jharkhand, 833205.
8.Gafar Ali Ansari, aged about 62 years, S/o Mahboob Ali Ansari, R/o Village Ghaghmunda PO & PS Kurdeg, District Simdega, Jharkhand, 835212.
-9. Nagendra Prasad, aged about 59 years, S/o Aditya Prasad, R/o Village Lawagain, PO Lawagain, PS Kuru, District Lohardaga, Jharkhand, 835213.
10. Sulowlin Topno, aged about 63 years, S/o Navin Toppo, R/o Village Kanjia, PO Kanjia, PS Bhandaria, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 822125.
11. Indra Kant Jha, aged about 56 years, S/o late Hira Lal Jha, R/o Bhanga Bandh, PO & PS Jarmundi, District Dumka, Jharkhand, 814141.
12. Manoj Kumar Sinha, aged about 57 years, S/o Basant kumar Sinha, R/o Bisunpur, PO & PS Bisunpur, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 835207.

13. Ram Bilas Sahu, aged about 59 years, S/o late Ratan Sahu, R/o Village Pot, PO & PS Sisai, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 835224.
14. Ram Kumar Sahu, aged about 59 years, S/o late Jatu Sahu, R/o Village Bargaon, PO & PS Sisai, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 835224.
15. Ram Sundar Mahto, aged about 61 years, S/o late Santu Mahto, R/o Village Oina, PO & PS Oina, District Lohardaga, Jharkhand, 835302.
16. Rajendra Sahu, aged about 63 years, S/o late Puran Sahu, R/o Village Champi, PO Larngo, PS Sisai, District Gumla, Jharkhand, 835224.
17. Mahendra Singh, aged about 61 years, S/o late Mahru Singh, R/o Khanda Nishan, PO Malsada, PS Bolwa, District Simdega, Jharkhand, 835223.
18. Samir Kumar Patra, aged about 58 years, S/o late Shashidhar Patra, R/o Chhota Bangurda, PO & PS Patamda, District East Singhbhum, Jharkhand, 832112.
19. Kajal Kumar Patra, aged about 64 years, S/o Trilochan Patra, R/o Village Chhota Bangurda, PO & PS Patamda, District East Singhbhum, Jharkhand.
20. Uttam Kumar Pati, aged about 62 years, S/o Anant Kumar Pati, R/o Village Nischintpur, PO & PS Sumaria, District East Singhbhum, Jharkhand.
21. Rameshwar Singh, aged about 59 years, S/o late Mangar Nath Singh, R/o Village Jaldega, PO & PS Jaldega, District Gumla, Jharkhand.table Court.
22. Bharat Ram, aged about 64 years, S/o late Bechan Sahu, R/o Village Tamra, PO & PS Tamra, District Simdega, Jharkhand. **..... Petitioner (s)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through the Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand, 1st Floor, Project Building, Dhurwa, PO and PS Dhurwa, District Ranchi, Jharkhand, 834004.

2. The Secretary, Higher Education, Department of School Education & Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, MDI Bhavan, Ground Floor, PO and PS Dhurwa, District Ranchi, Jharkhand, 834004. **..... Respondent(s)**

With

W.P.(S) No. 3050 of 2023

.....

1.Vidyapati Upadhyay (Age 63 Years), S/O- Sudarshan Upadhyay, R/O- vill. Chacharia PO- Shivpur PS-Majhiaon Dist.-Garhwa (Jharkhand)
2. Binod Kumar Tiwari (Age-56 Years), S/ O- Akshay Kumar Tiwari, R/O- Vill.- Kishunpur, PO+PS- Medninagar, Dist.- Palamu(Jharkhand).
3. Sunil Kumar Singh (Age 62 Years), S/O- Bhramdeo Narayan Singh, R/O- vill. Chitror Via M. Bandwar, PO + PS-Matihani, Dist. -Begusarai. (Bihar)
4. Kailash Prajapati(Age 65 Years), S/O-Jadunandan Prajapati, R/O- vill.+PO + PS-Kura, Dist. -Palamu (Jharkhand)
5. Krishna Kumar Thakur (Age 68 Years), S/O-Banarasi Thakur, R/O- vill. Kabisa PO-Marwaniya, PS-Ramna, Dist. Garhwa(Jharkhand)
6. Mudrika Thakur(Age 60 Years), S/O-Sardar Thakur, R/O- vill.- Kalyanpur, PO+PS+Dist. -Garhwa (Jharkhand)
7. Vijay kant Dubey (Age 66 Years), S/O-Swayamber Dubey, R/O- vill. Akalwani PO- Lagma PS -Meral, Dist. -Garhwa (Jharkhand)
8. Shyam Sundar jaiswal(Age 65 Years), S/O- Govind Prasad, R/O- vill.- Bhaga PO+ PS +Dist. -Banka (Bihar)
9. Akhilanand Mishra(Age 62 Years), S/O- Harivallav Mishra, R/O- vill. Tatamu PO + PS-Chandwa, Dist. Palamu(Jharkhand)
10. Mahendra Prasad Singh (Age 66 Years), S/O-Shivkeshwar Prasad Singh, R/O- vill. Donki PO + PS+,Dist. -Latehar(Jharkhand)
11. Sudama Prasad Gupta (Age-60 Years) S/O- Jagarnath Sahu R/O- vill. +PO + PS+, Dist. -Latehar (Jharkhand)
12. Dewendra Dwivedi (Age 65 Years), S/O-Late Madhusudan Dwivedi, R/O- vill. Aryapuri Ratu Road Ranchi PO + PS Sukhdeo Nagar, Dist. -Ranchi (Jharkhand)
13.Awdhesh Prasad (Age-60 years), S/O- Ramsihansan Bhagat, R/O-Latehar (Jharkhand). Vill.+PO+PS-Balumath, Dist.-. **..... Petitioner (s)**

Versus

1. The state of Jharkhand.

2.The State of Jharkhand through the Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi.
3. The Secretary, school Education & Literacy Department, Government of Jharkhand, Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi.
4. The secretary, primary, Secondary and Higher Education, Government of Jharkhand, Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi
5. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Jharkhand, Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi
6. The Dy. Director, Primary Education Government of Jharkhand, Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi.
7. The Secretary, Department of Law & Justice Government of Jharkhand Project Building Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi.
8. The Secretary, Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms Government of Jharkhand Project Building Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi.
9. The secretary, Finance Department Government of Jharkhand, Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi
10. The Cabinet Secretary Government of Jharkhand Project Building Dhurwa, PO+PS-Dhurwa, Dist.- Ranchi

..... Respondent(s)

.....

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

.....

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Navniti Prasad Singh, Sr. Adv
Mr. Vaibhaw Niti, Adv.
Mr. Baibhaw Gahlaut, Adv.
Mrs. Sunita Kumari, Adv
Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, Adv

For the Respondents : Mr. Manish Kr., Sr. S.C.-II
Mr. Ashwini Bhushan, A.C. to Sr. S.C.-II
Mr. Kunal Chandra Suman, A.C. to G.P.-II

.....

C.A.V. ON: 12/08/2026 **PRONOUNCED ON: 14/09/2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Since, common issues are involved in both these writ petitions, they were heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

Prayer

3. In W.P.(S) No. 1926 of 2022

(A) For issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari, and/or order, direction for quashing of the order dated 16.12.2021 (Annexure 13) issued by Respondent No.2 whereby, the claim of the Petitioners was arbitrarily rejected by Respondent No.2.
(B) For issuance of an appropriate consequential writ, and/or order, direction upon the Respondents to absorb the Petitioners (who were working as Supervisors in Non-Formal Education Programme) into the services of the State of Jharkhand in light of the judgment and order of the Hon'ble High Court of judicature at Patna in 'Bishundeo Choudhary & Ors. v. The State of Bihar & Ors.'; 1995 (1) PLJR 123, and order dated 20.07.2000 in MJC. No. 3442 of 1997 passed prior to the bifurcation of the erstwhile State of Bihar and also, pay other consequential benefits accruing thereof.
(C) For issuance of an appropriate writ, and/or order, direction commanding the Respondents to act pursuant to the letter dated 23.12.2000 (Annexure 5) issued by the Secretary, Primary Education, Government of Bihar.
(D) For issuance of an appropriate writ, and/or order, direction to hold and declare that the action of the Respondents in rejecting the representations of the Petitioners seeking absorption in services of State of Jharkhand as arbitrary and illegal.

4. In W.P.(S) No. 3050 of 2023:-

a. For issuance of appropriate writ(s)/order(s)/, direction(s) for quashing order dated 16/12/2021 (Annexure-13) issued by respondent no. 3 whereby where under the claim of the petitioners for regularization/absorption was arbitrarily rejected by the respondents.
b. For issuance of appropriate writ (s)/order(s)/, direction(s) to absorb the petitioners (Who were working as Non in formal Education Program), in the light of order passed in Bishnudeo Choudhary & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar & Ors (1995 (1) PLJR 123) as well as per the order dated 20/7/2000 passed in MJC No. 3442 of 1997, prior to the Bifurcation of the erstwhile state of Bihar.
c. For issuance of order(s)/, appropriate writ(s)/direction(s) to the respondents for payment of consequential benefit thereof to the benefits accruing petitioners who attained the age of superannuation.
d. For issuance of appropriate writ(s)/order(s)/, direction(s) & commanding the respondents to pursuant act the letter dated 23/12/2000, issued by the Secretary Primary Education Government of Bihar.
e. For issuance of appropriate writ(s)/order (s)/, direction(s) to hold and declare that the action the respondents regarding none consideration of the regularization and rejecting the same twice

occasion is an arbitrariness of the respondents committed in their part and illegality.
f. Any other relief or reliefs as Lordships may deem fit and proper the petitioner which entitled under the Your for is very much facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.

5. As per the pleadings, these petitioners were appointed as Supervisors under the Non-Formal Education Programme, a Centrally sponsored scheme introduced in the year 1981-82 for imparting elementary education to children in the age group of 6–14 years. Under the said programme, posts of Supervisors and Instructors were created and appointments were made on payment of fixed honorarium.

The petitioners were appointed during the 1980s by the erstwhile State of Bihar after following the process of advertisement and selection and continued to work as Supervisors for more than three years.

6. It is their case that the educational qualifications and process of selection of Supervisors under the Non-Formal Education Programme were substantially similar to those appointed under the Adult Education Programme.

7. Subsequently, disputes arose concerning parity in service conditions and absorption of Supervisors working under the Non-Formal Education Programme. A number of writ petitions came to be filed before the Patna High Court and, during their pendency, the State of Bihar formulated the *"Bihar Prarambhik Niyukti Niyamavali and Sanshodhan Niyamawali, 1993"*

providing for absorption/regularisation of such Supervisors against the posts of Primary Teachers or equivalent posts. The Full Bench of the Patna High Court in *Bishundeo Choudhary & Ors. v. State of Bihar & Ors.,* reported in *1995 (1) PLJR 123,* disposed of the proceedings on 11.11.1994 after taking note of the Scheme formulated by the State. Thereafter, in *C.W.J.C. No. 1216 of 1995*, the Patna High Court, by order dated 19.09.1995, directed the State to act in accordance with the Scheme. As the Scheme was not implemented, contempt proceedings, including *M.J.C. No. 3442 of 1997*, were instituted and were disposed of on 20.07.2000 with a direction to take a decision in terms of the Scheme within six months.

8. In the meantime, pursuant to the decisions taken by the State of Bihar and the directions issued for preparation of a panel, a final list of 2,655 Non-Formal Education Supervisors who had worked for at least three years was prepared, in which the names of the petitioners also found place. Out of the said 2,655 Supervisors, 676 belonged to the territories which, upon bifurcation of the erstwhile State of Bihar on 15.11.2000, became part of the State of Jharkhand. Accordingly, by letter dated 23.12.2000, the Secretary, Primary and Adult Education Department, Government of Bihar communicated the list of 676 Supervisors to the Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand for taking necessary steps for their absorption.

9. The petitioners contend that while the State of Bihar subsequently absorbed approximately 1,863 similarly situated Supervisors in Class-III posts, no corresponding action was taken by the State of Jharkhand in respect of the 676 Supervisors falling within its territory.

10. Further after the Non-Formal Education Programme came to an end in the year 2001 and no action was taken towards their absorption, the Supervisors approached this Court in *W.P.(S) No. 1333 of 2002* and, pursuant to an order dated 21.02.2002, their representations were considered but rejected on 02.04.2003. Aggrieved thereby, *W.P.(C) No. 2413 of 2003* was instituted seeking, inter alia, implementation of the Scheme of absorption framed by the erstwhile State of Bihar.

By judgment dated 03.03.2021, this Court quashed the order dated 02.04.2003 and remitted the matter to the respondents for fresh consideration after granting an opportunity of hearing to the parties.

Pursuant thereto, the 2nd Respondent issued a public notice dated 06.07.2021, whereupon the petitioners submitted their representations on 19.07.2021. As no decision was taken within the stipulated period, the petitioners instituted *Cont. (Cvl.) No. 680 of 2021*; however, during the pendency of which Respondent No. 2 passed the impugned order dated

16.12.2021 once again rejecting their claim for absorption/regularisation. Hence this writ petition.

11. <u>Submissions on behalf of the Petitioners.</u>

12. Mr. Navniti Prasad Singh, Ld. Sr. Counsel representing the petitioners submitted that the petitioners were engaged as Supervisors under the Non-Formal Education Programme in the erstwhile State of Bihar and their claim for absorption cannot be treated as a fresh claim for regularisation simpliciter. According to him, the petitioners' rights flow from a long chain of judicial proceedings commencing prior to the bifurcation of the State of Bihar and from the Scheme for absorption which was itself placed before and noticed by the Full Bench of the Patna High Court.

13. It has been submitted by the Ld. Sr. Counsel that pursuant to proceedings before the Patna High Court, the erstwhile State of Bihar prepared a Scheme in the year 1993 for absorption/regularisation of Supervisors working under the Non-Formal Education Programme to the post of Primary Education Teacher or equivalent posts. Thereafter, a final exercise was undertaken for identification of eligible Supervisors and a list of 2,655 Non-Formal Education Supervisors was prepared, out of whom 676 were working in South Bihar. The names of the petitioners admittedly find place in the said final panel.

14. Ld. Sr. Counsel further submitted that in the contempt proceedings arising out of the earlier litigation, the Patna High Court, by order dated 20.07.2000, directed the State authorities to act in terms of the Scheme and the observations of the Full Bench within a period of six months. Before the aforesaid period could expire, the State of Bihar was bifurcated on 15.11.2000. Thereafter, by communication dated 23.12.2000, the Government of Bihar forwarded to the State of Jharkhand the names of 676 Supervisors who had fallen within the territory of the newly created State and requested appropriate action for their absorption.

15. It has been contended that the bifurcation of the State cannot operate to the prejudice of the petitioners. The panel had been prepared before bifurcation and all 2,655 Supervisors formed one homogeneous class. Whereas the State of Bihar subsequently absorbed about 1,863 Non-Formal Education Supervisors in Class III posts; therefore the petitioners, merely because they came to fall within the State of Jharkhand, have been denied corresponding treatment.

16. Ld. Sr. Counsel also relied upon the fact that the State of Jharkhand itself absorbed approximately 200 Supervisors of the Adult Education Programme and that the concerned Minister of the State of Jharkhand had, in the year 2012,

expressed its view that the petitioners should be treated at par with their counterparts in Bihar.

17. Mr. Singh, Ld. Sr. Counsel further submitted that the judgments and orders passed by the Patna High Court prior to the appointed day continue to bind the successor State of Jharkhand and cannot be nullified by an executive decision. Mr. Singh accordingly contended that the Scheme, the final panel and the judicial directions issued prior to bifurcation created an accrued right which could not subsequently be defeated merely because of the territorial reorganisation of the State.

18. Ld. Sr. Counsel finally referred to the judgment dated 03.03.2021 passed in *W.P.(C) No.2413 of 2003* whereby this Court quashed the earlier rejection and remanded the matter to the competent authority to take a fresh decision after affording appropriate opportunity to the parties. It has been submitted that, notwithstanding the specific observations made in the said judgment, the respondents once again rejected the petitioners' claim by the impugned order dated 16.12.2021 without properly considering the pre-bifurcation judicial orders, the Scheme, the final panel and the subsequent absorption of similarly situated persons.

19. <u>Submissions on behalf of the Respondents</u>

20. Per contra, Ld. Counsel appearing for the State submitted that the entire foundation of the writ petition proceeds on an erroneous assumption that the petitioners were holding posts under the regular establishment of the State. The petitioners were engaged under a centrally sponsored Non-Formal Education Scheme and were merely part-time Supervisors working on honorarium. They were never appointed against any sanctioned post or regular pay-scale.

The State has specifically pleaded that they worked only for limited hours and received a fixed honorarium and that their engagement was linked entirely to the duration and existence of the Scheme.

21. Ld. Counsel further submitted that there was neither creation of regular posts; nor selection against notified vacancies. The Non-Formal Education Scheme itself was time-bound and stood closed after withdrawal of the Scheme by the Central Government.

22. It has been further submitted by the respondent-State that once the Scheme itself ceased to exist, no vested right survived in favour of the petitioners to demand absorption in a regular establishment.

23. The Rules framed by the State of Jharkhand in the year 2015 relating to regularisation also do not assist the petitioners because those Rules contemplate persons working

against created posts, whereas the petitioners were neither Government servants; nor occupants of any permanent or temporary Government post.

24. Ld. Counsel for the State-respondents further rely upon the judgment in *L.P.A. No.421 of 2017* wherein the Division Bench held that, notwithstanding the decisions rendered in proceedings relating to the State of Bihar, the State of Jharkhand has the power, jurisdiction and authority to take an independent decision on the question of regularisation or absorption on the merits of its own case.

He finally submitted that the petitioners cannot seek a writ of mandamus compelling the State either to create posts or to absorb them in existing regular cadres, particularly when such posts are required to be filled in accordance with the prescribed recruitment procedure. The impugned order dated 16.12.2021, according to the respondents, was passed after consideration of the matter pursuant to the earlier remand and suffers from no illegality warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution.

25. <u>Finding</u>

26. Having heard Ld. Counsel for the rival parties and upon consideration of the pleadings and materials available on record, this Court finds that the principal relief sought by the petitioners, in substance, is a direction upon the State of

Jharkhand to absorb them into its regular establishment on the strength of the Scheme prepared by the erstwhile State of Bihar and the judicial orders passed prior to bifurcation.

27. There can be no dispute that the petitioners were associated with the Non-Formal Education Programme and that a panel of 2,655 Supervisors had been prepared, of whom 676 fell within the territory which subsequently became part of the State of Jharkhand.

28. It is equally evident that proceedings relating to the Scheme had remained pending before the Patna High Court for a considerable period and that directions were issued requiring the State of Bihar to act upon the Scheme.

29. However, the mere preparation of a panel for the purposes of a contemplated absorption exercise cannot, by itself, be construed as conferring an indefeasible right of appointment or absorption in the regular service of a successor State.

30. Significantly, the Full Bench judgment upon which considerable reliance has been placed by the petitioners itself records that the Court was not adjudicating the individual claims of the petitioners and intervenors. The Full Bench noticed that a Scheme had been prepared by the Government and left it open to the concerned persons to approach the Government for modification or amendment thereof. The writ applications were ultimately dismissed.

31. The order dated 20.07.2000 passed in the contempt proceedings also has to be understood in the context in which it was passed. The direction was to act in terms of the Scheme and the observations of the Full Bench. It cannot be read as an unconditional judicial command that each and every person whose name appeared in the panel acquired a right to permanent appointment irrespective of the subsequent constitutional reorganisation, the service structure of the successor State, availability of sanctioned posts and the applicable recruitment framework.

32. At this stage, it is also relevant to indicate that the instant issue, with respect to similarly situated in the State of Jharkhand has been deliberated by Division Bench of this Court in *L.P.A. No.421 of 2017*. The Division Bench categorically recognised the authority of the State of Jharkhand to take its own decision on claims for adjustment, absorption or appointment, notwithstanding the fate of proceedings concerning the State of Bihar.

33. Likewise, in *L.P.A. No.649 of 2017*, another Division Bench held in clear terms that appointment and regularisation are primarily matters of State policy and that the decision of the State of Bihar is not binding upon the State of Jharkhand.

34. It further upheld the view that employees engaged under a Scheme which had already been closed have no enforceable right to seek regularisation.

35. The aforesaid pronouncements have a direct bearing upon the fundamental premise of the petitioners' case. The contention that absorption granted by the State of Bihar must automatically be replicated by the State of Jharkhand cannot, therefore, be accepted. Parity under Article 14 cannot be invoked by overlooking a material distinction arising from separate State establishments and their independent decisions concerning creation and filling of posts.

36. The record further reveals that the petitioners were not occupying sanctioned posts in the regular establishment. The specific stand of the State is that their engagement was under a time-bound Scheme on honorarium and not against any substantive vacancy or pay-scale. The Scheme itself was subsequently closed.

37. In such circumstances, issuance of a writ directing absorption would necessarily require the Court either to compel creation of posts or to direct induction into an existing cadre dehors the normal recruitment process. Such a direction cannot follow merely from long pendency of the claim or from absorption granted by another successor State.

38. The reliance placed upon the order dated 03.03.2021 passed in *W.P.(S) No. 2413 of 2003* also does not advance the petitioners' case beyond requiring reconsideration by the competent authority. By the said judgment, the earlier rejection was quashed and the matter was remanded for a fresh decision in accordance with law after giving appropriate opportunity to the parties. No positive direction for absorption was issued.

39. Pursuant thereto, a public notice was issued, representations were submitted by the petitioners and thereafter a fresh order dated 16.12.2021 has been passed. Thus, the direction to reconsider the matter stood complied with.

40. A remand for reconsideration cannot be construed as a mandate that the authority must necessarily reach a conclusion favourable to the petitioners.

41. This Court is conscious of the fact that the petitioners have been pursuing the matter for a considerable length of time. That circumstance may invite sympathy, but cannot substitute the legal requirement of an enforceable right corresponding to a public duty. The power under Article 226 cannot be exercised to direct appointment or absorption in regular Government service where the engagement itself was under a time-bound Scheme. Since the Scheme stands closed,

no sanctioned posts were held by the petitioners and the competent State Government has taken a policy decision declining absorption.

42. Accordingly, this Court finds no such infirmity, arbitrariness or illegality in the order dated 16.12.2021 as would warrant interference in exercise of writ jurisdiction. The prayer for a direction upon the respondents to absorb the petitioners in Class III and/or Class IV posts is also not capable of being granted.

43. These writ petitions are, accordingly, dismissed. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

Dated: 14/09/2026
Amardeep/
A.F.R/

Uploaded on
17.9.2026