



2026:CGHC:23672

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 4605 of 2021

- 1 - Manish Mishra S/o Shri D.P. Mishra Aged About 50 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam Korba, R/o
Kosabadi, Paudi Bahar, Ward No. 21, Near Mgos Church, Korba, Distt.
Korba (Chhattisgarh), District : Korba, Chhattisgarh
- 2 - Vikas Shukla S/o Shri V.K. Shukla Aged About 45 Years Occupation
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 3 - Uday Mandal S/o N.G. Mandal Aged About 42 Years Occupation
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 4 - Manoj Shrivastava S/o Shri Jawahar Lal Shrivastava Aged About 45 Years
Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 5 - Sonau Ram Yadav S/o Shri Dokru Ram Yadav Aged About 40 Years
Occupation Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 6 - Khikram S/o Shri Nandram Aged About 50 Years Occupation Daily
Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 7 - Suklal Kewat S/o Shri Gambhir Kewat Aged About 40 Years
Occupation Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 8 - Sukhmandas S/o Shri Jeewandas Aged About 50 Years Occupation
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 9 - Ravi Sahu S/o Shru Ugrav Sahu Aged About 45 Years Occupation
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

- 10** - Ravi Rathore S/o Shri Jageshwar Rathore Aged About 44 Years
Occupation Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 11** - Rajesh Kewat S/o Shri Rambahori Aged About 45 Years
Occupation Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 12** - Suresh Shrivastava S/o Shri Baldau Shrivastava Aged About 42 Years
Occupation Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 13** - Trilochan Rathore S/o Shri Chaitram Aged About 38 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 14** - Kehmant Patel S/o Shri Sonau Aged About 48 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 15** - Amrit Lal S/o Shri Rupsingh Aged About 50 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 16** - Sanjay Kumar Jha S/o Shri Jagdish Jha Aged About 53 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 17** - Rajkumar Sahu S/o Shri Bharat Lal Sahu Aged About 45 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 18** - Suresh S/o Shri Patere Aged About 47 Years Occupation - Daily
Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 19** - Pappu S/o Shri Patre Suryawanshi Aged About 50 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 20** - Raja Rane S/o Shri Munnilal Aged About 47 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 21** - Raj Kumar S/o Shri Babulal Aged About 35 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

- 22** - Safar Ali S/o Shri Mahabub Aliaged Aged About 45 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 23** - Mohan Lal Dahariya S/o Shri Itwarwi Ram Aged About 47 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 24** - Dhaneshwar Rajwade S/o Shri Pasarnath Rajwade Aged About 50
Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil
And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 25** - Raja Ram S/o Shri Latelram Aged About 50 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 26** - Panchram S/o Shri Jethuram Aged About 50 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 27** - Phiruram S/o Shri Dukaluram Aged About 45 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 28** - Ramesh Sidar S/o Shri Shyamlal Aged About 47 Years Occupation
- Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)
- 29** - Tijram Dewangan S/o Shri Shyamlal Dewangan Aged About 41
Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil
And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 30** - Daneshwar Vaishnav S/o Shri Kushwaha Das Vaishnav Aged About
42 Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba,
Tahsil And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 31** - Shailendra Singh S/o Shri Yashwant Singh Aged About 43 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 32** - Gaurishankar Sahu S/o Shri N.P. Sahu Aged About 45 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 33** - Lilamber S/o Shri Hajari Lal Yadav Aged About 46 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)
- 34** - Hem Lal Choubey S/o Shri Mangal Choudhary Aged About 48

Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil
And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

35 - Shatrughan Tiwari S/o Shri Arun Kumar Tiwari Aged About 51 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

36 - Resham Lal S/o Shri Panchram Aged About 49 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

37 - Brij Lal S/o Shri Santosh Aged About 50 Years Occupation - Daily
Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

38 - Dileshwar S/o Shri Kanhaiya Aged About 51 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

39 - Radhe Yadav S/o Shri Vedram Yadav Aged About 49 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

40 - Sumitra Bai W/o Shri Shyamlal Aged About 50 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

41 - Billu Kodaya S/o Shri Narsaiya Aged About 49 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

42 - Chankeslu S/o Shri Chanaiya Aged About 50 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

43 - Mohan Rao S/o Shri Apparao Aged About 49 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

44 - Om Prakash S/o Shri Babulal Aged About 51 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

45 - Gopi Chand Rathore S/o Lt. Punnu Ram Rathore Aged About 51
Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil
And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

46 - Raju S/o Shri Kewal Prasad Aged About 49 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba

(Chhattisgarh)

47 - Vinod Kanwar S/o Shri Jira Singh Kanwar Aged About 46 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

48 - Ramlu S/o Shri Vainktaiya Aged About 51 Years Occupation - Daily
Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

49 - Keshar Lal Kanwar S/o Shri Tikait Ram Aged About 55 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

50 - S. Buchhi S/o Shri Ankaiya Aged About 50 Years Occupation - Daily
Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

51 - Santosh Kumar S/o Shri Mohanlal Aged About 49 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

52 - Santosh S/o Shri Jamuna Prasad Aged About 50 Years Occupation
- Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

53 - Sheela W/o Shri Jailal Aged About 53 Years Occupation - Daily
Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

54 - Balram S/o Shri Bhaiyaram Sahu Aged About 43 Years Occupation
- Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

55 - Shrinivas S/o Shri Rituraj Singh Aged About 52 Years Occupation -
Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba
(Chhattisgarh)

56 - Dadu Ram Patel S/o Late Gangaram Patel Aged About 38 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

57 - Sujeet Banjare S/o Reshamlal Banjare Aged About 47 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

58 - Vinay Choubey S/o Lt. Anil Choubey Aged About 48 Years
Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And
Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

59 - Savitri W/o Lt. Nahri Maitri Aged About 53 Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

60 - Deenbandhu Das Mahant S/o Kamal Das Mahant Aged About 56 Years Occupation - Daily Wages Employee, Nagar Nigam, Korba, Tahsil And Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Principal Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh), District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - The Under Secretary Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

3 - The Municipal Corporation Korba, Through Its Commissioner, Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

4 - Commissioner Municipal Corporation, Korba, Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

... Respondent(s)

Date of Hearing : **11.5.2026**

Date of Pronouncement : **15.6.2026**

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Rajkamal Singh, Advocate along with Mr. Suryapratap Yuddhveer Singh, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Vivek Siddharth Ojha, P.L.
For Respondents No. 3 and 4	:	Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

CAV Judgment

1) This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by sixty petitioners, seeking the following reliefs:

i. That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the impugned order dated 12.05.2020 passed by respondent no. 2.

ii. to That, this Hon'ble Court may be kind enough to direct the respondent authorities regularize the services of the petitioners from 14.07.2008.

iii. That, any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper may also kindly be granted to the petitioners in the interest of justice along with cost of the petition.

2) Facts of the case in a nutshell are that initially petitioners were engaged as daily wage employees under respondent No. 3 and at present they have completed more than 20 years of continuous service. A list of daily wage employees working with respondent No. 3 including petitioners was published on 2.8.2011 describing dates of appointment and respective posts. Meanwhile, State Government issued a circular depicting parameters for regularization of services of daily wage employees on 5.3.2008. This circular is in two parts – the first part deals with regularization of services of daily wage employees appointed prior to 31.12.1988 and the second part deals with regularization of employees engaged between 1.1.1989 to 31.12.1997. Clause three of part second deals with break in service and states that if there is break in service for more than one month in a particular year, claim of such an employee should not be considered for the purposes of regularization. While some of the petitioners were appointed prior to 1997, the remaining petitioners were appointed in the year 1997 and onwards. A copy of letter dated 11.8.2017 is annexed to the writ petition and marked as Annexure P/4. This letter is appended with the list of sanctioned and vacant posts on

31.7.2017 describing the number of vacancies available with respondent No. 3.

- 3)** Respondent No. 3 took decision to discontinue services of daily wage employees and thereafter petitioners preferred WPS No. 6112 of 2010 wherein order of status quo was passed in favor of the petitioners vide 28.10.2010. In between the department, vide its order dated 14.07.2008, took a decision to regularize the services of 35 employees, appointed in the year 1998 and onward. Subsequently, petitioners made a representation before the Principal Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department on 12.9.2018 claiming therein regularization of their services. The Petitioners preferred WPS No. 7815 of 2018 claiming therein regularization which was disposed vide order dated 27.3.2019 directing the respondents to consider the representation(s) preferred by the petitioner within four months. In compliance to the aforesaid order, respondent No. 3 vide order dated 4.10.2019 recommended names of 57 daily wage employees for regularization but respondent No. 1 vide order dated 12.5.2020 rejected the representations made by the petitioners on the ground that petitioners were appointed after 31.12.1997 and there were breaks in their service for more than one month in a calendar year.
- 4)** Mr. Rajkamal Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners were appointed between years 1997 to 1999

under the respondent No. 3 and nature of their engagement is inherently perennial. He further submits that petitioners are full-time employee working since last 23-24 years without any break. He contends that petitioners were appointed against sanctioned and vacant posts and according to letter dated 11.8.2017 posts are lying vacant with the respondent No. 3. He further contends that claim of petitioners cannot be rejected solely on the ground of break in service. He has placed reliance on the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matters of **Dharam Singh and Others Versus State of U.P. and Another**¹ and **Prem Chand and Others Versus State of Punjab and Another**². He prays for a direction to the respondent authorities to regularize the services of the petitioners.

- 5) On the other hand, Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, learned counsel for the respondents No. 3 and 4 submits that petitioners were never appointed against sanctioned and vacant posts and most of the them were appointed after 31.12.1997 therefore their claim with regard to regularization is misconceived and they cannot take shelter of circular dated 5.3.2008. He further submits that no advertisement was issued for filling up vacant posts and petitioners were never interviewed therefore also they have no right to claim regularization. He contends that respondent No. 1 duly scrutinized the claim of petitioners and rejected the same on

1. 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735

2. 2026 LiveLaw (SC) 394

the ground that petitioners were appointed after 31.12.1997 and there were breaks in their service. He has placed reliance on the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others Versus Uma Devi and Others**³. He further contends that this petition deserves to be dismissed.

- 6) Mr. Vivek S. Ojha, learned State counsel would support the arguments advanced by Mr. Agrawal.
- 7) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the respective parties, considered their rival submissions made herein above and carefully perused the documents placed on record.
- 8) It appears that petitioners are working with respondent No. 3 from year 1997 onward. A list of daily wage employees was published by respondent No. 3 on 11.8.2017 which depicts the dates of appointment and the posts occupied by the daily wage employees working with respondent No. 3 including petitioners. The said list shows that daily wage employees were appointed between year 1990 to 2000. A circular was issued by the State Government on 5.3.2008 streamlined procedure to regularize services of daily wage employees.
- 9) Petitioners claimed regularization of their services in light of the second part of said circular which deals with regularization of

3. (2006) 4 SCC 1

services of daily wage employee engaged after 1997. According to this part, claim of an employee for regularization shall be considered if he/she has completed ten years of uninterrupted service and there is break in service not more than one month in a particular year.

10) It is not in dispute that petitioners are still working with the respondent No. 3 and respondent No. 1 has considered the claim of some of the daily wage employees. Since more than 175 posts were lying vacant, petitioners preferred WPS No. 7815 of 2018 claiming therein regularization, which was disposed directing respondent authorities to consider their claim within period of four months. Respondent No. 1 vide order dated 12.5.2020 rejected the claim of petitioners on two grounds – (i) petitioners were appointed after 31.12.1997 and (ii) there were breaks in their service for period of more than one month in a particular year.

11) In **Dharam Singh** (supra), the claim for regularization of daily wage employees, who were engaged w.e.f. 8.4.1997 was rejected by the State citing financial constraints. The Hon'ble Supreme Court considered various aspects such as misuse of "temporary" labels, arbitrary termination, lack of career progression, using outsourcing as a shield and denial of basic rights and benefits. It was held that State departments must keep and produce accurate establishment registers, muster rolls and outsourcing arrangements and they must explain with evidence, why they

prefer precarious engagement over sanctioned posts where the work is perennial. It was also held that State is not a mere market participant but a constitutional employer and it cannot balance budgets on the backs of those who perform the most basic and recurring public functions. Relevant paragraphs 17 and 18 read as under :-

17. Before concluding, we think it necessary to recall that the State (here referring to both the Union and the State governments) is not a mere market participant but a constitutional employer. It cannot balance budgets on the backs of those who perform the most basic and recurring public functions. Where work recurs day after day and year after year, the establishment must reflect that reality in its sanctioned strength and engagement practices. The long-term extraction of regular labour under temporary labels corrodes confidence in public administration and offends the promise of equal protection. Financial stringency certainly has a place in public policy, but it is not a talisman that overrides fairness, reason and the duty to organise work on lawful lines.
18. Moreover, it must necessarily be noted that "ad-hocism" thrives where administration is opaque. The State Departments must keep and produce accurate establishment registers, muster rolls and outsourcing arrangements, and they must explain, with evidence, why they prefer precarious engagement over sanctioned posts where the work is perennial. If "constraint" is invoked, the record should show what alternatives were considered, why similarly placed workers were treated differently, and how the chosen course aligns with Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India. Sensitivity to the human consequences of prolonged insecurity is not sentimentality. It is a constitutional discipline that should inform every decision affecting those who keep public offices running.

12) Recently, Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Prem Chand** (supra) considered the issue of break in service ranging from 5 to 187 days and took note of the fact that large number of similarly placed employees have been regularized in various departments of State in view of policy instructions in spite of the fact that there were breaks in their service. Relevant paragraphs 18 to 20 read as under :-

18. The core question that falls for consideration is whether the Appellants are covered under the policy instructions dated 26.05.2003, 15.12.2006 and 18.03.2011 issued by the State of Punjab for regularization of ad hoc employees. It is not disputed that the Appellants were appointed before 13.06.1996. The Respondents have sought to exclude the Appellants solely on the ground that their service tenures contained breaks ranging from 5 to 187 days. Therefore, it has been argued that their engagements were not continuous, making them ineligible under the policy. Furthermore, it has been argued that they are also ineligible under the policy dated 18.03.2011 as the Appellants were no longer in service when it came into force.

19. We are unable to agree with this reasoning as it has come on record that a large number of similarly placed employees have been regularized in various departments of the State Government in view of the policy instructions dated 26.05.2003 and 15.12.2006 in spite of the fact that there were breaks in their service as in the case of the present Appellants. The details of as many as 46 ad hoc employees who were given the benefit of the policies have been brought forward who had breaks ranging from a period of 64 to 334 days i.e. periods longer than that in the case of the Appellants. This fact has not been disputed by the Respondents. Therefore, a case for parity is made out as the Appellants have service record with breaks ranging from merely 5 to 187 days. The State cannot application of the policy to the Appellants, who selectively deny the are identically situated with these persons, with no cogent justification.

20. Moreover, the breaks in service relied upon by the Respondents to deny regularization are, on a closer examination, artificial in nature. The Appellants were consistently re-engaged, save for short breaks, and continued to discharge their duties to the satisfaction of the appointing authorities on the same posts. The breaks do not reflect any genuine abandonment of service or voluntary cessation of employment. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the long service of the Appellants cannot be disregarded in lieu of artificial breaks and by leveling the initial employment as ad hoc.

13) With regard to **Uma Devi** (supra), respondent authorities failed to establish that petitioners were not appointed against any sanctioned and vacant posts and their appointments were illegal and arbitrary. In **Shripal Versus Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad**⁴, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has cautioned that **Uma Devi** (supra) cannot be used as a shield to justify exploitation through long term "ad-hocism", the use of outsourcing as a proxy, or the denial of basic parity where identical duties are exacted over extended periods. Relevant paragraph 14 reads as under :-

14. The Respondent Employer places reliance on Umadevi (supra) to contend that daily-wage or temporary employees cannot claim permanent absorption in the absence of statutory rules providing such absorption. However, as frequently reiterated, Uma Devi itself distinguishes between appointments that are "illegal" and those that are "irregular," the latter being eligible for regularization if they meet certain conditions. More importantly, Uma Devi cannot serve as a shield to justify exploitative engagements persisting for years without the Employer undertaking legitimate recruitment. Given the record which shows no true contractor-based arrangement and a consistent need for permanent horticultural staff the alleged asserted ban on fresh recruitment, though real,

4. 2025 SCC OnLine SC 221

cannot justify indefinite daily-wage status or continued unfair practices.

14) In this view of the matter, in my considered opinion, the principles articulated in **Shripal** (supra) apply with full force to the present case. Furthermore, the conduct of the respondent authorities is highly discriminatory. The claims of other daily-wage employees for regularization have already been favorably considered, whereas the petitioners, who are sailing in the same boat, have been left in the lurch. Accordingly, the order dated 12.5.2020 (Annexure P/1) is not sustainable in the eyes of law and is hereby quashed.

15) In result, the instant writ petition is **allowed**.

16) It is directed that the respondents No. 1, 3 and 4 shall re-consider the claim of petitioners with regard to regularization of their services in light of the observations made herein-above. It is expected that the entire exercise shall be completed by the authority(s) concerned within period of 180 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

Sd/-
(Rakesh Mohan Pandey)
JUDGE

Aj i n k y a

The date when the judgment is reserved	The date when the judgment is pronounced	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	
		Operative	Full
11.5.2026	15.6.2026	----	15.6.2026