

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1310 of 2014

IN

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 1087 of 2012

- =====
1. Munna Kumar Singh, S/O Sri Hira Singh, Resident of Village Balua, P.O. Balghat Balua, P.S. Ara Mufasil, District Bhojpur.
 2. Sharwan Kumar Keshari, S/O Late Ramanand Prasad Keshari, Resident of Village Singhi, P.O. Ara Chowk, P.S. Ara Nagar, District Bhojpur.
 3. Ashok Kumar, S/O Uday Prasad Singh, Resident of Village Shital Tola, P.O. Ara, P.S. Ara Nagar, District Bhojpur.
 4. Kamta Singh, S/O Budhu Singh Yadav, Resident of Village Chakiya, P.O. Belghat Balua, P.S. Ara Mufasil, District Bhojpur.
 5. Amrendra Kumar Singh, S/O Sri Muneshwar Singh, Resident of Village and P.O. Neknam Tola, P.S. Barahara, District Bhojpur.
 6. Shailendra Kumar, S/O Chulhan Prasad, Resident of Village Nawadah, P.O. and P.S. Nawadah, District Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Sri Ashok Kumar Sinha, the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Sri Dharmendra Singh Gangwar, the Secretary, Public and Administrative Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri E.L.S.N. Bala Prasad, the Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
4. Pankaj Kumar Pal, the District Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara.
5. Sri Animesh Kumar Parasar, the District Development Commissioner, Bhojpur at Ara.
6. Sri Suresh Kumar Sinha, the Additional Collector, Bhojpur at Ara.
7. Sri Wakil Prasad Singh, the Establishment Deputy Collector, Bhojpur at Ara.
8. Jafar Hussain, Nazarat Deputy Collector, Bhojpur at Ara.

.... Opp. Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Subhas Singh, Advocate

For the Opp. Party /s : Mr. R.R.K Pandey, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.N. SINHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 21-01-2015

In the light of the different orders passed in
M.J.C. No. 1087 of 2012, more particularly order dated
14.05.2012, petitioner nos. 2, 3, 4 and 6 have been appointed as

Class-IV employee in Ara Collectorate leaving petitioner nos. 1 and 5, who according to the authorities, do not fulfil the norms.

2. Counsel for the petitioners does not accept the position, as according to him, petitioner nos. 1 and 5 are also covered by the undertaking contained in order dated 14.05.2012 and corrigendum issued thereafter, as few others who have been appointed besides petitioner nos. 2, 3, 4 and 6 have put in even lesser number of days as daily wager in the Collectorate.

3. The contempt petition is, accordingly, disposed of granting liberty to the petitioners to raise such plea in a fresh representation/ writ petition.

(V.N. Sinha, J)

Rajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--