SL. No	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGES'S ORDERS
			WPSS No.724 of 2021
			Hon'ble Sharad Kumar Sharma, J.
			(Via Video Conferencing)
			(Via Viaco Comerenems)
			Mr. Harendra Belwal, Advocate for the
			petitioner.
			Mr. P.S. Bisht, Addl. C.S.C. for the State of
			Uttarakhand.
			The petitioner of the present writ petition has
			prayed for the following reliefs:-
			"i. Issue a writ, order or direction in the
			nature of mandamus commanding the
			respondents to treat the services of the
			petitioner as a confirmed employees
			appointed under Dying-in-Harness Rules
			since her date of initial appointment i.e.
			14.03.2011.
			ii. Issue a writ order or direction in the
			nature of mandamus commanding the
			respondents to pay her all consequential
			benefits.
			iii. Issue a writ order or direction in the
			nature of mandamus commanding the
			respondents to give her admissible Pay Scale
			to the petitioner as is being drawn by her
			other counterpart in the department.
			iv. Issue a writ order or direction in the
			nature of mandamus commanding the
			respondents to take a decision on the
			representation dated 06.04.2021, filed by the
			petitioner (Annexure No.08 in this writ
			petition).
			v. Issue any other suitable order or
			direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit
			and proper in the circumstances of the case.
			vi. To award the cost of the writ petition
			to the petitioner."

The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the husband of the petitioner, who was appointed with respondent no.5, on 26.12.1988 on the post of Beldar/Anurakshak, and later on placed in a work charge establishment 31.08.2001. But unfortunately, during the service period he met with the sad demise on 20.10.2010 and as a consequence thereto the petitioner, who is the widow of the deceased employee has raised a claim before the respondent (competent authority), to be considered for compassionate appointment, which was processed by the respondents and she was ultimately appointed under the Harness Rules, by virtue of an order dated 14.03.2011, but however, the appointment which was made under the Dying-in-Harness Rules in relation to the petitioner, was made on the basis of a daily rated employee.

The petitioner has come up with the case that though she was appointed as a daily rated employee on 14.03.2011, but later on her services too had been placed in a work charge establishment w.e.f. 10.05.2012. She has submitted that she has been consistently approaching the respondents, that since her initial appointment of 14.03.2011 was made under the Dying-in-Harness, it ought to have been on regular basis and not as a daily rated employee, she contends that she has submitted representation and the last representation being that of 06.04.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that this Court has already considered the issue in a writ petition being Writ Petition No.640 of 2021 (S/S)Rakesh Singh State VS. Uttarakhand, decided by the iudgment of 11.06.2021 based on the various pronouncement of this Court; as well as that of Allahabad High Court and the writ petition was disposed of directing the competent authority to take a decision on the representation for the purposes of grant of a regular status to the employees, who had been appointed on compassionate grounds.

This aspect of the matter, that the issue stands covered by the aforesaid judgment of 11.06.2021, which was rendered by this Court, in a

bunch of writ petitions with a leading Writ Petition No.640 of 2021 (S/S) Rakesh Singh vs. State of Uttarakhand, is a fact not disputed by the Addl. C.S.C. Hence, this writ petition, too would stand disposed of in terms of the judgment of 11.06.2021 and the respondents are directed to proceed accordingly. Subject to the above observations, the writ petition stands disposed of. (Sharad Kumar Sharma, J.) 30.06.2021 Arti

