

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI  
**W.P.(S) No. 5499 of 2023**

--

1. Sheo Shankar Sau, aged about 39 years, son of Tirtha Basi Sau, resident of Patpur, Baharagora, P.O. and P.S. Baharagora, District East Singhbhum (Jharkhand).
2. Krishna Kant Singh, aged about 43 years, son of Late Janardan Prasad Singh, resident of Q. No. B III- 497, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi (Jharkhand).
3. Bholu Shankar, aged about 42 years, son of Late Kamdeo Nath Mishra, resident of Ratu Palace, P.O. and P.S. Ratu, District Ranchi (Jharkhand).
4. Sandip Kumar Mahto, aged about 37 years, son of Manik Chand Mahto, resident of Bansaruli, P.O. Chota Muri, P.S. Silli, District Ranchi (Jharkhand).
5. Shivnandan Yadav, aged about 41 years, son of B.K. Yadav, resident of Karamtoli, (Ahirtoli) P.O. Morabadi, P.S. Lalpur, District Ranchi (Jharkhand).
6. Umesh Kumar, aged about 33 years, son of Shiv Bharat Sahu, resident of Village Boreya, P.O. Boreya, P.S. Kanke, District Ranchi (Jharkhand)

.... **Petitioners**

**Versus**

1. State of Jharkhand through Chief Secretary, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi.
2. Additional Chief Secretary, Health, Medical Education and Family Welfare Department-Cum-Food Commissioner, Nepal House, Doranda, P.O. and P.S. Doranda, District Ranchi.
3. Director Drug Control Department R.C.H. Campus, Namkum, P.O. and P.S. Namkum, District Ranchi.
4. Secretary Personnel, Administration Reform and Official Language Department, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. and P.S. Dhurwa, District Ranchi

..... **Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN**

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Vijay Bahadur Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Mithilesh Singh, G.A.-IV

--

**13/10.06.2026**

The instant writ application has been preferred by the petitioners praying for a direction upon the respondent authorities to regularize the services of the petitioners in their respective post and grades with all consequential benefits.

**2.** From the record, it appears that counter affidavit has been filed and it has been specifically indicated that as per 2019 Regularization Policy of the State, there was a condition precedent that the person must be serving for more than 10 years and since all these petitioners were appointed in 2012 onwards; hence they have not completed 10 years of service.

**3.** In reply to the aforesaid averment/contention of the respondents, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that still the petitioners are working.

**4.** Having regard to the above, interest of justice would be sufficed by directing the petitioners to file individual representation before the respondent no. 2 as early as possible.

The moment, the respondent no. 2 receives the representation(s), he shall take a decision in the matter in the background that now the petitioners have completed more than 10 years of service and also they are still working without any break in service, as claimed by the respective petitioners.

It goes without saying that the concerned respondent while taking the decision in the case of respective petitioners, shall also bear in mind the latest judgment passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in the subject of regularization. The entire exercise of passing the fresh order shall be completed within a period of 12 weeks from

the date of receipt of such representation(s) and copy of same should be forwarded to the individual petitioners.

**5.** Accordingly, the instant writ application stands disposed of. Pending I.A(s) stands closed.

**(Deepak Roshan, J.)**

10<sup>th</sup> June, 2026

*Jk*  
*Uploaded on*  
*01/07/2026*