



## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

**WPS No. 764 of 2026**

**SANJAY SHARMA *versus* STATE OF CHHATTISGARH**

### **Order on Board**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>22/01/2026</b></p> | <p>Mr. Rajendra Tripathi, Advocate for the petitioners.</p> <p>Mr. Love Sharma, Panel Lawyer for respondent No.1 and 2-State.</p> <p>Mr. Rakshit Tiwari, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate for respondent No.3.</p> <p>Heard.</p> <p>Issue notice.</p> <p>Learned State Counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 &amp; 2, and Mr. Tiwari accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.3, hence process fee need not be paid for issuance of notice to respondents. They pray for and are granted three weeks time to file reply.</p> <p>Also heard on I.A. No.1/2026, an application for grant of interim relief.</p> <p>Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioners are working as daily wage employee in respondent No.3 since last more than 20 years. Pursuant to order dated 15.1.2015, services of petitioners, along with others, were</p> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

regularized. However, subsequently, the order, Annexure P-1, is issued stating that regularization is not possible, which is *per se* illegal. He contended that petitioners are still working as daily wage employee with respondent No.3, however, they are having apprehension that they may be discontinued from service at any moment, therefore, some interim protection may be granted till reply to petition is filed.

Learned counsel for respondent No.3 submits that discontinuation of service is only apprehension of petitioners and no such decision is taken.

On due consideration of submission of learned counsel for respective parties, purely as an interim measure, it is directed that status quo, as it exists today, with respect to service of petitioners shall be maintained by the parties, till next date of hearing.

List this matter after three weeks.

Sd/-=

(Parth Prateem Sahu)  
Judge

roshan/-