SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			SPA/352/2023 Dayananad Tamta --Appellant **Versus** State of Uttarakhand and others --Respondents **Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, A.C.J.** **Hon'ble Subhash Upadhyay, J.** Mr. T.A. Khan, Senior Advocate, assisted by Mr. Vinay Bhatt, Advocate for the appellant. 2. Mr. J.C. Pande, Standing Counsel for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. This intra-court appeal is directed against the final order dated 14.09.2023, passed by learned Single Judge in WPSS/1676/2023. By the said order, writ petition filed by appellant claiming regularisation and also challenging the decision taken by competent authority, whereby his claim for regularisation was rejected, was dismissed. 4. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant submits that the appellant was initially engaged in Uttarakhand Administrative Academy, Nainital in the year 1993 and after serving for about ten years in Nainital, he was shifted to Uttarakhand Institute of Rural Development and

			Panchayati Raj, Rudrapur, where he is serving continuously since 2004. It is contended that, after serving for more than thirty years as contract/outsourced employee, he has earned a right to be considered for regularisation. It is contended that the State Government has framed Regularisation Rules, which were last amended in 2025 and appellant is eligible to be considered for regularisation as per the said Rules. 5. Learned State Counsel, however, disputes the contention raised on behalf of learned counsel for the appellant. He submits that appellant was engaged in Uttarakhand Administrative Academy only in 1997 and he served there from time to time till 2023 through contractor and he is thereafter serving in Uttarakhand Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj, Rudrapur. 6. Learned State Counsel further submits that appellant is no more in employment, however, learned counsel for the appellant disputes the said contention. He submits that appellant is very much in employment. 7. Having regard to the fact that State Government has amended the Regularisation Rules by extending the cut

			off date for determining eligibility, therefore, we think that ends of justice would be met if appellant is permitted to approach the competent authority by making a fresh representation. 8. The Special Appeal is, accordingly, disposed of with liberty to appellant to make representation to Director, Uttarakhand Institute of Rural Development and Panchayati Raj, Rudrapur. If he makes representation within ten days, decision thereupon shall be taken, as per law, within four months thereafter. **(Subhash Upadhyay, .J.) (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, A.C.J.)** 18.11.2026 Navin NAVEEN CHANDRA