

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4962 of 2013**

**In**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 20589 of 2012**

=====

1. Uday Kuamr Singh, Son of Deon Narayan Singh, Resident of Village-  
Nayagaon, P.S.- Nayagaon, District- Begusarai.

2. Devendra Prasad Singh, Son of Chandradeo Singh, Resident of Village-  
Madhurapur- I, P.S.- Teghra, District- Begusarai.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

2. The Divisional Commissioner, Munger Division, Munger, namely, S.N.  
Raju.

3. The Collector, Begusarai, namely, Manoj Kumar.

4. The Chairman-cum-District Establishment Committee, Begusarai,  
namely, Manoj Kumar.

5. The Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Begusarai, namely,  
Sonlal Akela.

6. The District Malaria Officer, Begusarai, namely, Purshottam Kumar.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravindra Nath Dubey

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Birju Prasad, G.P. 13

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      14-09-2016                      The petitioners filed writ application, being C.W.J.C.  
  
No. 20589 of 2012, for inclusion of their names in the panel for  
appointment against Class-IV posts, in terms of policy decision  
contained in letter No. 16441, dated 03.12.1980 and dated  
29.06.2011, etc. The writ application was disposed of on  
17.04.2013, with a direction to the District Magistrate, Begusarai,  
to consider the claim of the petitioners for inclusion of their names

in the panel for appointment to the Class-IV post in accordance with decision of this Court in case of Mausami, D.D. Chhirkao Kramchari Sangh & Ano Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors. (C.W.J.C. No. 11798 of 2011).

Since passing of the order, claim of the petitioners was considered and rejected.

Learned counsel submits that their reliefs and claims have been rejected without considering the decision of this Court in case of Mausami, D.D. Chhirkao Kramchari Sangh & Ano Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors. (C.W.J.C. No. 11798 of 2011). As such claim of the petitioner is disposed of.

I do not find the same to be a matter one of contempt. Nonetheless, the petitioners are at liberty to challenge the order, if so desire.

The contempt application is disposed of.

**(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J.)**

kunal/-

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