

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9848 of 2008

=====

Lala Murli Manohar Lal , son of Lala Shiv Shankar Lal, resident of New Area, Bisar Talab, Gaya, Police Station-Civil Lines, District- Gaya

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Transport Department, State Transport Department, Vishweshwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna

2. The State Transport Commissioner, Bihar, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Om Prakash Upadhyay
Mr. Mithilesh Kr.Upadhyay

For the Respondent/s : Mr. SC-16

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

.....

3 08-04-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel no.16.

The petitioner, invoking writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article-226 of the Constitution of India, has prayed for directing the Respondents to consider his objection i.e. Annexure-4 to the writ petition, which according to the petitioner was filed pursuant to notice issued in continuation of Advertisement no.1/2008.

Of course, in this case no counter affidavit has been filed, however, learned State Counsel by way of referring to internal page-3 of Annexure-1, submits that as per advertisement, a notice for appointment of Motor Vehicle Inspector was

published and in continuation of the said advertisement after preparation of merit list, objection was invited vide Annexure-3 to the writ petition. He submits that since appointment itself was only for 12 months, at this moment in the present writ petition no positive order is required to be passed.

Besides hearing learned counsel for the parties, I have also perused the materials available on record, particularly Annexure-1 to the writ petition. On perusal of advertisement i.e. Annexure-1, it was categorically noticed that the said advertisement was for engaging Motor Vehicle Inspector only for 12 months. Thereafter, it appears that vide Annexure-3, objections were invited. Keeping in view lapse of time as well as in view of nature of engagement, the Court considers that no positive order is required to be passed in the present case.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--