



2026:CGHC:17056



2026:CGHC:17056

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3217 of 2026

1 - Takeshvar Sahu S/o Deva Ram Sahu Aged About 38 Years R/o Post - Chhatan, Lormui, H. No. 55, Barpara, Dindori, Dhindauri, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development Agency Through Secretary, Vikas Bhawan, Civil Lines, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Chief Executive Officer Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development Agency, Vikas Bhawan, Civil Lines, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

4 - Collector District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

5 - Upper Secretary Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh

6 - Executive Engineer Rural Development Division, Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development Agency, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

7 - Assistant Engineer Rural Development Division, Chhattisgarh Rural Road Development Department, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Himanshu Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu
Order on Board

15/04/2026

1. Petitioner has filed this writ petition, seeking following reliefs:-



*“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to regularize the services of the petitioner on the post being held by him in light of the judgment passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Karnataka Vs. Umadevi** (2006) 4 SCC 1 .*

10.2 That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief/relief's in favor of the petitioner, which the Hon'ble Court deemed fit & just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including awarding of the costs of the petitioner.”

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner is employee of respondent department and is appointed on the post of Assistant Grade- II (Contractual) by order dated 07.11.2012, since then he is continuously performing his duty on the said post. Petitioner is in service since 2012 however, he has not been regularized. Therefore, the petitioner may be permitted to submit a fresh representation before the concerned authority and direction be issued to the concerned authority to consider and take decision on the claim of petitioner for regularization of his service within specified time frame. He places reliance upon the judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in case of **Gopi Sao and Ors. Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors** in a writ appeal bearing **WA No. 14 of 2017 dated 07.01.2018.**
3. Learned counsel for State submits that as petitioner is not pressing this writ petition on merits and is only seeking direction to consider and take decision on representation, he is having no objection.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.
5. Claim as raised by the petitioner in this writ petition is that he is continuously working as a daily basis since 2012, however, till date he has not been regularized.



6. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Narendra Kumar Tiwari & Others Versus State of Jharkhand & Others** reported in SCC (L&S) 2018 (2) 472 considered the issue of claim of regularization of temporary/daily wages employees, who had completed 10 years of service. Further, Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Jaggo Versus Union of India** reported in (2024) SCC Online SC 3826 has further observed that the government departments to lead by example in providing fair and stable employment. Engaging workers on a temporary basis for extended periods, especially when their roles are integral to the organization's functioning, not only contravenes international labour standards but also exposes the organization to legal challenges and undermines employee morale.
7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Bhola Nath Vs. The State of Jharkhand & Ors.** [SLP (Civil) No.30762 of 2024] and connected Special Leave Petitions (Civil) vide its order dated 30th January 2026 has observed that respondent -State was not justified in continuing the appellant's services on sanctioned posts for over a decade under nomenclature of contractual engagement and thereafter denying them consideration for regularization and have further directed for regularizing the appellants therein, in service.
8. Recently, Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Dharam Singh & Ors. Vs. State of UP & Anr.** (2025 SCC OnLine SC 1735) has strongly deprecated the culture of "ad-hocism" adopted by States in their capacity as employers. Hon'ble Supreme Court also criticized the practice of outsourcing or informalizing recruitment as a means to evade regular employment obligations, observing that such measures perpetuate precarious working conditions while



circumventing fair and lawful engagement practices and observed thus:

“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.

xx x

20. We have framed these directions comprehensively because, case after case, orders of this Court in such matters have been met with fresh technicalities, rolling “reconsiderations,” and administrative drift which further



prolongs the insecurity for those who have already laboured for years on daily wages. Therefore, we have learned that Justice in such cases cannot rest on simpliciter directions, but it demands imposition of clear duties, fixed timelines, and verifiable compliance. As a constitutional employer, the State is held to a higher standard and therefore it must organise its perennial workers on a sanctioned footing, create a budget for lawful engagement, and implement judicial directions in letter and spirit. Delay to follow these obligations is not mere negligence but rather it is a conscious method of denial that erodes livelihoods and dignity for these workers. The operative scheme we have set here comprising of creation of supernumerary posts, full regularization, subsequent financial benefits, and a sworn affidavit of compliance, is therefore a pathway designed to convert rights into outcomes and to reaffirm that fairness in engagement and transparency in administration are not matters of grace, but obligations under Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India.”

9. Taking into consideration that the petitioner is engaged on contractual basis since 2012, the circular issued by the State Government dated 05.03.2008 for regularization of daily wage/temporary employee who are working prior to 1997 and the relief as claimed by petitioner for regularization of his service as also considering the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above mentioned cases, this writ petition at this stage is disposed permitting the petitioner to submit fresh comprehensive representation before concerned authorities and if, such representation is submitted, the concerned authority shall consider and take decision on the representation keeping in mind the period of service which the petitioner has completed as also the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court on the issue of regularization of daily wage/temporary



2026:CGHC:17056

-6-

employee, expeditiously, in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably within a further period of 04 months from the date of receipt of representation.

10. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with aforesaid observation and direction.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Jyoti