

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10164 of 2011

=====

Nagendra Kumar, Aged About 50 Years , son of Late Sahdeo Singh
Resident of Village - Patoriya, P.O. + P.S. - Adampur, District - Nalanda.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Water Resources, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Revenue Administration, Department Of Water Resources, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Special Officer Cum Deputy Secretary, Department Of Water Resources, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Nalanda At Bihar Sharif.
6. The Deputy Collector, Revenue Division, Bihar Sharif, Nalanda.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 18-04-2016 Heard Sri Arun Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned AC to GP No.27.

The petitioner, invoking writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, has made a prayer to direct the respondents to give him regular appointment as “Moharrir” and direct for other consequential benefits.

In the writ petition the petitioner has not bothered to bring on record even the appointment letter. However, it is admitted fact that after 1994 the petitioner has not functioned.

In the counter affidavit a stand has been taken that

petitioner was initially engaged as seasonal worker and after the end of the season same had come to an end automatically. Moreover, after 1994 no work was taken from the petitioner.

Keeping in view the fact that petitioner has not brought on record even the appointment letter to show as to how he was appointed as well as the fact that the writ petition was filed after several years, if even for the time being it is assumed that he was working in the year 1994, the present writ petition was filed in the year 2011 for regularization and also keeping in view the fact which has been disclosed in the counter affidavit that petitioner was a seasonal worker and after 1994 he has not worked, there is no point for issuance of any direction for regularization.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

U			
---	--	--	--