

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7595 of 2015

- =====
1. Bharat Kumar S/o Late Ram Pravesh Ram, Resident of Veterinary College Campus, P.S.- Airport, Town and District- Patna.
 2. Santosh Mallik S/o Sri Bandhu Mallik, Resident of village and P.S- Kurhani, District- Muzaffarpur.
 3. Dharam Dom S/o Sri Suresh Dom, Resident of village-Dharhara, P.S.- Paliganj, District- Patna.
 4. Bablu Ram S/o Late Mahendra Ram, Resident of Veterinary College Campus, P.S.- Airport, Town and District- Patna.
 5. Rekha Kumari D/o Late Suraj Prasad, Resident of Turha Toli, Sahpur, P.S.- Sahpur, District- Patna.
 6. Soni Kumari W/o Late Chandeshwar Prasad, Resident of Village-Sarai, P.S.- Maner, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Health, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Indira Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences, Through its Director, IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.
3. Deputy Director (Administration) IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.
4. Medical Superintendent, IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.
5. Principal, IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.
6. Senior Administrative Officer, IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.
7. Administrative Officer, IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.
8. Assistant Administrative Officer, IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Banawari Sharma

Mr. Shiv Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. SC27- KINKAR KUMAR

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 18-05-2015

Petitioners who were working as Sanitary Attendants on contract have rushed to the High Court seeking quashing of Anneuxre-6 dated 30th April, 2015.

By virtue of this communication it has been made clear to the petitioners that their contract will cease w.e.f. 15.5.2015.

Petitioners not only seek quashing of the order but even a direction to permit them to continue at least till regular appointments are made.

The Court after hearing the counsel for the petitioners comes to a considered opinion that no interference is warranted with the said decision because the Court cannot compel to maintain a relationship on contract or subsist with the contract keeping in mind the nature of the engagement and the work which petitioners were rendering.

In absence of any arbitrariness, in fact, no writ would lie before this Court.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have filed representations in terms of Annexure-7. That is another issue. It is for the respondents to consider the same. The Court has nothing to offer by way of observation.

Writ application is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

R.K.Pathak/-

U			
---	--	--	--