

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4253 of 2011

- =====
1. Mousmi D.D.T. Chhirkao Karamchari Sangh, district Branch Samastipur, Post Office, Police Station and District – Samastipur through its Secretary Guru Sharan Sahni, son of Sri Ram Sakal Sahni.
2. Guru Sharan Sahni, son of Sri Ram Sakal Sahni, Secretary of Mousmi D.D.T. Chhirkao Karamchari Sangh, District – Branch Samastipur and resident of village – Zitwarpur Nizamat, Post Office – Samastipur College, P.S. – Muffasil, District – Samastipur.
3. Mahesh Rai, son of Rameshwar Rai, President of Mausmi, D.D.T. Chhirkao Karamchari Sangh, District – Branch Samastipur, resident of village – Makimabad, P.O. Kharaj Jitwarpur, P.S. – Muffasil, District – Samastipur.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sri Amarjeet Sinha, Secretary, Department of Health, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Dr. Surendra Prasad, District-in-Chief, Health Service, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Dr. S.K. Aman, the Deputy Chief Malaria Officer, Bihar, Patna.
5. Dr. Vinay Kumar Yadav, the District Malaria Officer, Samastipur.
6. Sri Kundan Kumar, the District Magistrate, Samastipur.
7. Ram Bahadur Paswan, son of Sri Maghan Paswan, Vice President of Mousmi, D.D.T. Chhirkao Karamchari Sangh, District – Branch, Samastipur and resident of village Ekawara, P.O. and P.S. – Singhia, District – Samastipur.
8. Raj Kumar Mahto, son of Sri Domi Mahto, Joint Secretary of Mousmi, D.D.T. Chhirkao Karamchari Sangh, District – Branch, Samastipur and resident of village – Bhuswar, P.S. and P.O. – Bibhutipur, District – Samastipur.
9. Rajendra Mahto, son of Late Bhulo Mahto, Treasurer of Mousmi, D.D.T. Chhirkao Karamchari Sangh, District Branch, Samastipur and resident of village and P.O. – Kapau, P.S. – Bibhutipur, District – Samastipur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suraj Narain Yadav, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Ms. Nivedita Nirvikar, G.P.- 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2. 17-02-2016

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State, this Court is of the view that having made the panel of seasonal workers and, thereafter, having advertised for the said post, the Collector, Samastipur, has not violated this Court's order. In fact, it is pursuant to this Court's orders that steps have been taken after applications are received pursuant to the advertisement. The panel which is there for the people, who had been working earlier and people who are freshly applied, a similar panel would be made, subject to relaxation of age, in so far as the petitioners and likes other are concerned, the selections would be finalized. This is the procedure, as envisaged in my order, the Collector is doing nothing different. The Collector, Samastipur is directed to expedite the matter.

Therefore, I find no reason to entertain this application. This application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--