SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS UKHC010059242022 2026:UHC:9822
			UKHC010059242022 **WPSS/804/2022** Govind Singh --Petitioner **Versus** State of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Rakesh Thapliyal, J.** Mr. C.S. Rawat, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned Standing Counsel for the State/1 to 6. 3. By the instant petition, the petitioner is praying for the following reliefs:- *"(i) Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of certiorari to quash and set aside the impugned order dated 07.01.2019 issued by Chief Conservator of Forest, Human Resources Development and Personal Management, Uttarakhand Dehradun and communication issued by Divisional Forest, Almora on 24.01.2019 by which the claim of the petitioner has been rejected for appointment in regular establishment. (Contained As Annexure No.1(Colly) to this writ petition.)* *(ii) Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing in the respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner in the light of the Government Order dated 29.06.2010 and equally treat the petitioner as the provision given in the Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.* *iii) Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing in the respondents to grant appointment treating the petitioner at par with the person given appointment.* *iv) Issue any other or further writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case."* 4. In compliance of the previous order, Ms. Tejaswini Patil, the Chief Conservator of Forest, Kumaon Region, is present in Court and submits that the Government Order dated 29.06.2010 is applicable prospectively and the previous cases are not covered by this Government Order, and even otherwise, the

Department takes a liberal approach in respect of the claim of the petitioner and engaged him on daily wages basis in the year 2011.

5. The main grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner's appointment on daily wager be treated to be substantive one since in the identical issue of Garhwal Region, the substantive appointments were given to those who are the dependents of the persons died in a fire incident.

6. Mr. Rawat, submits that the present petitioner is also one of the family members of the person who died in order to save life of five children in a fire incident in the forest area in the year 2003, therefore, the same treatment should be given to the petitioner. He further submits that in reference to his claim his case was recommended to the Higher Authorities, therefore, he may be given a liberty to make a fresh representation to the Principal Chief Conservator of Forest so that he may consider his claim.

7. Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned Standing Counsel has not raised any objections on such submissions.

8. In such view of the matter, the instant writ petition is disposed of finally by giving a liberty to the petitioner to make a representation to the Principal Chief Conservator of Forest within 15 days' by highlighting the grievances, and if such a representation is made the Principal Chief Conservator of Forest is directed to consider the case of the petitioner sympathetically keeping in mind that the similar benefits has been given in the Garhwal Region. While considering the representation of the petitioner, the Principal Chief Conservator of Forest should also keep in mind that the petitioner has served for more than 15 years on daily wages basis, therefore, in such an eventuality the petitioner has legitimate expectation to get the permanent status.

(Rakesh Thapliyal, J.)
29.10.2026

Nitesh/