

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4951 of 2011

- =====
1. Manoj Kumar Srivastava, son of Sri Janakdhari Prasad, Comprehensive Cost of Cultivation Scheme Department of Agriculture Economic RAU, Pusa, at + P.O. Pusa, P.S. Pusa, District Samastipur.
 2. Shankar Kumar Pathak, son of Sri Ramesh Chandra Pathak, Sugar Cane Research Institute, Pusa, at + PO Pusa, P.S. Pusa, District Samastipur.
 3. Ganesh Kumar, son of Sri Shashidhar Pandit, Sugar Cane Research Institute, Pusa, at and PO Pusa, P.S. Pusa, District Samastipur.
 4. Nobo Kumar Basu, son of Sri Nirmal Chandra Bose, Department of Forestry, Faculty of Agriculture, RAU, Pusa, at and PO-Pusa, District Samastipur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Sri Mewa Lal Chaudhary, the Vice Chancellor, Rajendra Agricultural University, Pusa, Samastipur
2. Dr. R.C. Roy, the Registrar, Rajendra Agricultural University, Pusa, Samastipur
3. Devashish Dutta, Director Administration, RAU, Pusa, Samastipur
4. The State of Bihar through Sri Ashok Kumar Singh, Agriculture Production Commissioner, Government of Bihar, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sri Niwas Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kumar Sachin Gp24

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 04-08-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the University.

Learned counsel for the University has drawn the attention of this Court towards order dated 26.2.2013 from which it appears that the case was to be listed after disposal of MJC No.2595 of 2012. The aforesaid case has been disposed of and the copy of the order has been placed before this Court. The Court has disposed of the aforesaid application and observed as follows:

“It is the case of the respondent University that pursuant to the direction issued by the Hon ‘ble Supreme Court, the action had already been initiated and as many as 173 casual employees who had competed 15 years’ as such have been regularised in service. To fill in remaining vacancies by the direct recruitment, the advertisement has been issued; applications have been received; applications are scrutinized and the recruitment process is in the operation. The respondents have assured this Court to complete the interview and to issue appointment letters to the selected persons by 30th June, 2013.

In view of the exercise undertaken by the respondent-University and the aforesaid assurance, we have no reason to believe that the University is bent upon not to carry out the directions issued by the Hon’ble Supreme Court or for that matter of this Court. The question of the contempt of this Court, therefore, shall not arise. All these petitions are accordingly disposed of.

We, however, reserve liberty to the writ petitioners to revive these petitions in case the University fails to stand by its assurance and to make appointment by 30th June, 2013.”

In such view of the matter, this contempt application does not survive and the same is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Vinay/-

U			
---	--	--	--