

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10926 of 2014

=====

Sunil Kumar Sinha, Son of Late Parmeshwar Prasad Sinha, Resident of Adarsh Nagar (Behind Hero Honda Agency), P.S.- Muffasil, District- Samastipur

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Sub Divisional Education Officer, Samastipur
3. The Director (Secondary Education), Bihar, Patna
4. The Under Secretary, Personnel & Administrative Reforms Department, Bihar, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amaresh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. RAJESH SINGH

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-01-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents.

2. The petitioner seeks quashing of Memo no. 337 dated 30.01.2012 issued by the Director (Secondary Education), Bihar whereby reinstatement/absorption of the petitioner has been cancelled.

3. The relief of the petitioner is founded on the premise that his reinstatement has been rejected in teeth of the order dated 21.04.2011, passed in L.P.A. No. 1471 of 2009 and other analogous appeals.

4. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as a Clerk in the office of Sub-Divisional Officer, Samastipur vide memorandum no. 742, dated 04.07.1985.

5. The petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned order dated 30.01.2012 of the Director (Secondary Education), Bihar. He submits that he fulfilled all the requisite requirement for being appointed on the post. He submits that services of some of the similarly situated employees were terminated by different orders of the authorities. Being aggrieved, they moved this Court in their respective writ applications, which are contained in Annexure- 5 Series. He submits that his case stands fully covered under the aforesaid orders.

6. The petitioner has already filed a representation before the Director (Secondary Education), Bihar. The matter is remitted to the Director (Secondary Education), Bihar with a direction that if the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the employees as contained in Annexure-5 Series, then in such case similar treatment would also be accorded to him.

7. With the aforesaid observations and directions, this application stands disposed of.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J.)

Uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--