IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
L.P.A. No.534 of 2025
with
I.A. No.11793 of 2025

---

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Department of Mines & Geology, Yojna Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi.
3. The Director (Mines), Department of Mines and Geology, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi.
4. The Additional Director (Mines), Department of Mines and Geology, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi.
5. The Deputy Director (Mines), Department of Mines and Geology, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi.
6. The District Mining Officer, (D.M.O.), Latehar, Jharkhand.

..... Appellants.

-Versus-

1. Narendra Kumar, son of Sri Vijay Kumar, resident of village-Akbarkpur, P.O. & P.S. Rajhat, Nawada, Bihar, presently residing at New Saket Nagar, Saryu Marg (Pokhar Toli), P.O. & P.S. Hinoo, District-Ranchi.
2. Satish Prasad, son of Binod Prasad Singh, resident of Road No.01, Upper Chutia, Krishnapuri, P.O. & P.S. Chutia, District-Ranchi. ..... Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Appellants : Mr. Indranil Bhaduri, S.C.-IV
For the Respondents:

Order No.02 **Date: 04.05.2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

2. I.A. No.11793 of 2025 seeks condonation of delay of 121 days in instituting this appeal.

3. Considering the reasons set out, we condone the delay and dispose of the aforesaid I.A.

4. With the consent of the learned counsel for the appellants, we have taken up this L.P.A. to consider whether it deserves admission.

5. By the impugned order, the learned Single Judge has directed that the petitioners/respondents, who are working as Computer

Operators/Data-entry Operators should be given benefit of the resolution dated 28th July, 2025, wherein a lumpsum payment has been fixed at Rs.16,480/-. Benefit of further revisions is also allowed, if and when such revisions are ordered.

6. The learned counsel for the appellants submits that the resolution dated 28th July, 2025 applies for contractual employees and the respondents herein were only daily wagers.

7. The above distinction, cannot be accepted. The contractual employees are to be given the benefit of a fixed lumpsum in terms of the resolution dated 28th July, 2015, then, such a benefit cannot be denied to daily wagers. Ultimately, both do the same work. Appointment of daily wagers, to a certain extent, is also permitted on a contract of appointment. Therefore, we see no error in the view taken by the learned Single Judge in this matter.

8. The L.P.A. is, accordingly, dismissed without any order for costs.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

4th May, 2026
Sanjay/Rohit
Uploaded on 06.05.2026