



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

1. Writ Petition Service Single No.1580 of 2026

Sarvesh Kumar Sharma --Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents

2. Writ Petition Service Single No.1581 of 2026

Rajendra Kumar Balmiki --Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents

3. Writ Petition Service Single No.1582 of 2026

Kamal Singh Rawat --Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents

4. Writ Petition Service Single No.1583 of 2026

Bahadur Singh Rawal --Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents

5. Writ Petition Service Single No.1584 of 2026

Subhash Chandra Sakta --Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Raveendra Singh Bisht, learned counsel for petitioners.

Mr. Pradeep Haiariya, learned Additional C.S.C. with Mr. Hargovind Pant, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand.

Mr. Sandeep Kothari, learned counsel for respondent Nos.3 and 4.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J. (Oral)

Since common question of law and facts are involved in all these writ petitions, hence, they are being taken up together and are being decided by this common judgment.

2. These writ petitions have been filed by the petitioners seeking their regularization on the post they are holding in terms of the Daily Wage, Work Charge,



Contractual, Fixed Pay, Part Time and Adhoc Employees Regularization Rules, 2013 read with Daily Wage, Work-Charged, Contract, Fixed-Pay, Part-Time and Ad-hoc Employees Regularization (Amendment) Rules, 2025, with consequential benefits.

3. It is the contention of the petitioners that petitioners are working with the respondent-department on different posts for the last almost 18 to 22 years as contractual employees and are being paid a consolidated payment of remuneration.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners contends that since petitioners have put in more than sufficient service for the purpose of regularization, therefore, the respondents should regularize their services against the vacant post in the department.

5. He further contends that services of petitioners are required by the respondent Nos.3 and 4, which is reflected for the reason that they have been working continuously and uninterruptedly against the vacant posts for the last so many years and the nature of their work is perennial in nature.

6. Learned counsel for petitioners further submits that they have moved separate representations to the respondent No.4 in the year 2025 and 2026, but, those representations are still pending disposal with respondent No.4.

7. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that ends of justice would be met if respondent No.4 is directed to decide those representation submitted by the petitioners separately in the year 2025-2026, within a stipulated period.



8. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent Nos.3 and 4 contends that he has no objection, if such an order passed by this Court and if it is directed that respondent No.4 shall consider and decide the representations of petitioners on the merits of each case.

9. Accordingly, all the writ petitions are disposed of finally and it is provided that respondent No.4 shall decide the representations moved by petitioners separately in the year 2025-2026, considering the merits of each case, within a period of eight weeks from today, by passing speaking and well reasoned order, in the light of Rules referred by the petitioners.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

17.06.2026

PN