

(2026) 08 UK CK 2645

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition Service Single No. 327 of 2025

Dikri Devi

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Uttarakhand & Ors.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-08-2026

Acts Referred:

Regularization Rules, 2013

Citation : (2026) 08 UK CK 2645

Hon'ble Judges : Pankaj Purohit, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mr. Deepak Petshali, Mr. Narayan Dutt, Me. Yogesh Pandey

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J. (Oral)

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner before this Court seeking regularization on a Class-IV post as per Regularization Rules, 2013, as amended up to date.

2. The petitioner contends that the petitioner was working with respondent no.2 and 3 as a Sehyogi daily wager since 10.03.2005. The petitioner rendered 20 years' long service as Sehyogi a Class IV post with the respondent no. 2 and 3. The petitioner sought regularization on the said post and submitted an application to the respondent no. 2 and 3 and to the State Government as per Regularization Rules, 2013, i.e. to Director/Registrar, Dairy Development Department Haldwani. The application of the petitioner is still undecided.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent no. 2 and 3 submits that since the proposal is pending with the respondent no. 4 for regularization of the petitioner, and the recommendation dated 07.01.2023 is strongly in favour of the petitioner, rest of the exercise is to be done at the level of the respondent no.4 by the selection Committee as per Bye laws 41(2)(b) of the Bye laws of the Society.

4. The learned counsel for the State submits that the proposal for regularization of the petitioner could not be considered in view of the pendency of the WPSB NO. 616 of 2018, Narender Singh and another vs. State of Uttarakhand and others.

5. It is further contended by the learned counsel for the State that now the said writ petition has been decided by the Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.02.2024 and therefore now the proposal sent by the respondent no. 2 and 3 would be considered.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record and in view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the State as well as the respondent nos. 2 and 3, the writ petition is finally disposed of. The respondent-Competent Authority/Selection Committee in the State Government is directed to consider the claim of the petitioner for regularization as per the proposal sent by the respondent no. 3 dated 20.04.2023 under the byelaws.