

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6799 of 2015**

- =====
1. Kamlesh Kumar Thakur, son of Late Ram Sherestha Thakur, resident of village-Jagdishpur Ram, P.O.-Chakhazi, District-Samastipur.
  2. Vijay Kumar Singh, son of Late H.P. Singh, resident of mohalla-Mirza Heyat Bagh Trimurti Bhavan, P.O.-Lal Bagh, District-Darbhanga.
  3. Surendra Kumar Kant, son of Late Nago Pandit, resident of village + P.O.-Bhandari, District- Nalanda (Bihar).
  4. Sudhir Kumar Verma, son of Late Ramesh Chandra Verma, resident of at Paruhar, P.O.-Dumra, District-Saharsa.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Agriculture Production Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Agriculture Production Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Joint Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Rajendra Agriculture University, PUSA through its Vice-chancellor, PUSA, Samastipur.
5. The Vice-chancellor, Rajendra Agriculture University, PUSA, Samastipur.
6. The Registrar, Rajendra Agriculture University, PUSA, Samastipur.
7. The Director (Administration), Rajendra Agriculture University, PUSA, Samastipur.
8. The Comptroller, Rajendra Agriculture University, PUSA, Samastipur.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Giri  
For the Respondent State: Mr. SC27- KINKAR KUMAR  
For the University : Mr. Arvind Ujjwal

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date: 17-08-2015**

Writ application of the petitioners is disposed of with a direction that the rationale and reasoning given by this Court in **CWJC No.15661 of 2014**, which was the case of **Md. Najmuddin and others Vs. State of Bihar and others** and other analogous cases, shall also govern the case of these petitioners.

Respondent University authorities are directed to extend similar benefits to these petitioners if they fall in the same class of employees, in whose favour the order for grant of benefit has been passed.

In fact, the Court expresses displeasure against the University concerned because in the judgment dated 7.4.2015 passed in Md. Najmuddin's case the Court had given a clear direction that even all such employees who have not approached this Court for similar relief will be extended the benefit. The Court fails to understand as to why every employee will be compelled to come to the Court to beget similar kind of observation before the benefit could be extended. This is unacceptable position. The order must be brought to the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor. If such challenges are thrown before this Court, the Court will contemplate taking appropriate action against the Vice-Chancellor because he has no business to burden the system by frivolous litigation where no adjudication as such is required.

**(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)**

R.K.Pathak/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|