

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6411 of 2015

=====

Sudhir Kumar Ojha, son of Sri Krishnadeo Ojha, Resident of village- Lahldpur
Patahi, P.S. Muzaffarpur Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Patna

..... Respondents 1st set

4. The Additional Director General, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Bihar, Patna
5. The Superintendent of Police- cum- Station Head Officer, Vigilance Police-
Station, 6 Circular Road, Patna.
6. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Investigation Bureau,
Muzaffarpur

..... Respondents 1st set

7. Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur through the
Vice Chancellor
8. The Vice Chancellor, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University,
Muzaffarpur
9. The Registrar, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur

..... Respondents 1st set

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. P.K. Verma, AAG-3 Mr. S.K. Sharma, AC to AAG-3
For Vigilance Deptt.	:	Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For University	:	Mr. Vikash Ratan Bharti, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 05-12-2016

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition in public interest has been
filed to enquire into temporary affiliation of the colleges granted in



the meeting held on 22nd of January, 2015 even though the colleges did not fulfil the minimum criteria for affiliation and a vigilance case is pending against the respondent university.

3. The petitioner claims to be a social worker, but what kind of social work he has undertaken has not been disclosed in the writ application. He appears to be a busybody having no interest in the subject-matter. Still further we find that since the Vigilance is already examining the affairs of the University, therefore, no further direction is called for from this Court. The present writ petition seems to be lacking in *bona fide*.

4. Consequently, we do not find any merit in the present writ petition.

5. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Hemant Gupta, J)

(Vikash Jain, J)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	08.12.2016
Transmission Date	N/A

