WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

&

The Hon'ble Smt. Urmita Datta (Sen), Member (J) The Hon'ble P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

Case No OA - 1422 of 2014

Biswanath Gope -Vs- The State of West Bengal & Others.

Biswanath Gope -Vs- The State of West Bengal & Others.		
Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date	
2	and dated signature	
	of parties when necessary 3	
For the Applicant : Mr. K. Ghosal,	Ū	
Advocate.		
For the Respondents: Mr. A. De,		
(Departmental Representative)		
Land & Land Reforms Department		
The instant application has been filed praying for		
regularisation of the service of the applicant. As per the		
applicant, he was engaged as Daily Rated Worker since		
1998 and had worked under various departments. In the		
year 2011, he made a representation before the authority for		
consideration of his case for regularisation. However, no		
step has been taken by the respondent. Being aggrieved		
with, he has been filed the instant application.		
The respondents have filed their reply wherein they		
have stated that the applicant was engaged as daily-rated		
labour during the election period intermittently which is not		
a perennial nature of job. He was never engaged		
continuously since 1998 as claimed by the applicant.		
Further as per the Hon'ble Apex Court's judgement passed		
in the Secretary, State of Karnataka -vs- Uma Devi		
"reported in (2006) 4 SCC 1", a person who was never		
engaged by a proper selection and did not work		
	For the Applicant: Mr. K. Ghosal, Advocate. For the Respondents: Mr. A. De, (Departmental Representative) Land & Land Reforms Department The instant application has been filed praying for regularisation of the service of the applicant. As per the applicant, he was engaged as Daily Rated Worker since 1998 and had worked under various departments. In the year 2011, he made a representation before the authority for consideration of his case for regularisation. However, no step has been taken by the respondent. Being aggrieved with, he has been filed the instant application. The respondents have filed their reply wherein they have stated that the applicant was engaged as daily-rated labour during the election period intermittently which is not a perennial nature of job. He was never engaged continuously since 1998 as claimed by the applicant. Further as per the Hon'ble Apex Court's judgement passed in the Secretary, State of Karnataka -vs- Uma Devi "reported in (2006) 4 SCC 1", a person who was never	

	-
Form No.	

Vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Biswanath Gope

Case No. OA - 1422 of 2014		
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature of parties when necessary
1		3
	continuously for at least ten years before passing of this	
	order, he is not entitled for any regularisation.	
	The counsel for the applicant has further referred one	
	judgement passed by the Hon'ble High Court dated	
	07.09.2005 passed in WPST No. 704 of 2004 and has	
	prayed for extension of benefit of that judgement. He has	
	also referred Memorandum dated 20.05.2013 and has	
	submitted that he may be regularised on the basis of afore-	
	mentioned circulars.	
	Departmental representative of the respondent has	
	further submitted that the circulars and judgement referred	
	by the applicant in rejoinder has no relevancy with regard to	
	regularisation. Therefore, the applicant has no right to	
	claim regularisation under those circulars. Therefore, they	
	have prayed for dismissal of the circulars and judgement.	
	We have heard both the parties and perused the	
	records. From the perusal of the document enclosed by the	
	applicant, it is noted that the applicant was engaged	
	intermittently during the election period for certain	
	duration for one month or more but was never engaged	
	continuously since 1998. The Hon'ble High Court in	

	Biswanath Gope
Form No.	

Vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. OA - 1422 of 2014

Case No. OA - 1422 of 2014			
Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3	
	order dated 07.09.2005 has passed the following order:	<u> </u>	
	"Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.		
	Pursuant to our previous order dated 21.7.2005		
	an affidavit has been affirmed by one Mukul Kanti		
	Sarkar, the District Magistrate and Collector of		
	Purulia. We have perused the material on		
	record		
	On recording the aforesaid assurance of the		
	learned Advocate General we dispose of the writ		
	petition. The order passed by the learned Tribunal is		
	accordingly modified. "		
	From the perusal of the afore-mentioned judgement, it		
	is noted that the Hon'ble High Court has clearly opined that		
	there is no scope for regularisation of the petitioner of the		
	said case. However, on the basis of submission made by the		
	Learned Advocate appearing for the State that the petitioner		
	of the said case may be engaged for some time as per the		
	policy of the Government and in future if any subsequent		
	policy comes. As the applicant was not a party in the said		
	application and no such assurance or submission made by		
	the respondent in the instant case therefore, there is no		
	question of extension of benefit of judgement dated		

	Biswanath Gope
Form No.	

Vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature of parties when necessar
1		3
	07.09.2005 as the Hon'ble High Court never directed to the	
	State government for continuation of engagement or	
	regularisation thereto. Further in the instant case, though	
	the applicant has prayed for regularisation but he was	
	engaged for some times intermittently and thereafter,	
	disengaged for a long till 2014. Therefore, there is no scope	
	of extension of the said order as prayed for as the applicant	
	has prayed for regularisation. Further, the Notification	
	dated 02.05.2013 and 04.05.2015 has no relevancy as both	
	the circulars are related with the continuation of service of	
	casual / daily rated / contractual workers who had worked	
	more than ten years or less than ten years but no proposal	
	for regularisation. Therefore, in our considered opinion, the	
	circulars are not also applicable in the instant case as the	
	applicant has only prayed for regularisation of his service.	
	Therefore, we do not find any reason to entertain the O.A.	
	Accordingly, the O.A. is dismissed being devoid of merit,	
	even after Uma Devi, no scope for continuation of service.	
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER (A) MEMBER (J)	
A.K.P.		