

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10035 of 2011

=====

Shivshankar Sundram, son of Late Parmeshwar Prasad, resident of Village-Durukhi Gali, Bankipore, P.S- Pirbahore, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Principal Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Bihar Public Service Commission through the Secretary, Bailey Road, Patna.
7. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.
8. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhakar Dwivedi, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to GA-9
Mr. Satyabir Bharti, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 29-02-2016

I.A. No.275 of 2016

Heard Sri Prabhakar Dwivedi, learned counsel, who was assisted by Sri Sanjay Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AC to GA-9 and Sri Satyabir Bharti, learned counsel for the Respondent/Bihar Public Service Commission on Interlocutory Application i.e. I.A. No.275 of 2016, wherein a prayer has been made for allowing the petitioner to amend the prayer in the writ petition.

In view of facts and circumstances, no order is required to be passed on I.A. No.275 of 2016.

With consent of the parties, I have heard the writ petition on its merit.

In this case, the petitioner has made a prayer for directing the Respondents to appoint him on the post, which remained vacant. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, some posts had remained vacant. However, at the time of argument, it was not disputed by the parties that the vacancies, which were left earlier, had already been carried forward for subsequent advertisement.

In view of facts that the post, which had remained vacant, had already been carried forward for the next advertisement, there is no need to pass any positive order in favour of the petitioner.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--