IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 7707 of 2025

Bhola Tudu, aged about 44 years, son of Late Shivlal Tudu, Resident of Village Rupaidih, PO-Raniganj, PS-Jamtara, District-Jamtara, Jharkhand. **... ... Petitioner(s)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Govt. of Jharkhand, PO & PS-Doranda, District-Ranchi.
3. Engineer In Chief, Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Govt. of Jharkhand, PO & PS-Doranda, District-Ranchi.
4. The Executive Engineer, Drinking Water and Sanitation Division, Jamtara, PO, PS and District-Jamtara, Jharkhand

... ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Swapan Maji, Advocate
For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Divyam, AC to SC-IV

02/ 05th January, 2026

1. Heard the Parties.

2. The petitioner in this writ petition, prays to quash the order dated 25.07.2025, contained in आ०सं०-02/न्याया-1018/2023 /150 (Annexure-5). He also prays for regularization.

3. After hearing the parties and after going through the impugned order, I find that in WP(S) No.5999 of 2023, the Coordinate Bench of this Court directed the petitioner to file a representation before respondents, which was supposed to be considered by them.

4. The petitioner appear and filed a representation along with the documents which were considered by the respondents and the impugned order was passed rejecting the claim of petitioner to regularize him.

5. After going through the impugned order, I find that it is an admitted case that the petitioner was not appointed by the respondents, he was only engaged on need basis as and when

required. He worked in 1995 for 11 days, in 1996 for 15 days, in 2006 for 104 days, in 2007 for 134 days and in 2008 for 234 days. Further, there is no appointment letter of the petitioner on record also. It is the fact that as and when the respondents found it necessary, the work was taken from him. This will not give any right to the petitioner to be regularized against permanent and vacant post. Further, there is no advertisement pursuant to which the petitioner was engaged nor he worked continuously which is evident from the impugned order itself.

6. What the petitioner is trying to project before this Court is that he has worked regularly. This is a question of fact and the same is disputed by the respondents and is not in consonance with the order passed at Annexure-5, thus, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in this writ petition. Accordingly, this writ petition stands **dismissed**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

05.01.2026
S.K.D., cp2
Uploaded on 07.01.2026