

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5487 of 2013

- =====
1. Mahesh Prakash Yadav Son of Sri Jay Prakash Yadav resident of village - Baijnathpur, P.S.- Khijersarai, Block- Khijersarai, District- Gaya
 2. Rajesh Kumar Son of Sri Jagdish Prasad resident of village - Mafa, P.S.- Atri, Block- Atri, District- Gaya
 3. Draupadi Kumari Daughter of Ramdeo Prasad resident of village - Barka Karasan, P.S.- Imamganj, Block- Imamganj, District- Gaya
 4. Tuleshwar Prasad Yadav Son of Sri Dilchand Yadav resident of village - Sinho, P.S.- Mohanpur, Block- Mohanpur, District- Gaya
 5. Jitendra Prasad Son of Late Nanhaku Prasad resident of village - Sarkanda, P.S.- Wajirganj, Block- Wajirganj, District- Gaya
 6. Pushplata Daughter of Sri Ram Prasad Sah resident of Mohalla- Chhotki Delha (Near Saraswati Niketan), P.S. Delha, Block- Nagar Chandauti, Dist.- Gaya
 7. Kumari Rambha Sharan Daughter of Late Akhilesh Prasad resident of village- Rajbalia, P.O.- Kewla Kala, P.S.- Dumaria, Block- Dumaria, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar Patna
2. The Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The State Disability Commissioner, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The Director, Social Security and Disability Directorate, Bihar Patna
5. The Assistant Director, Social Security, Gaya
6. The District Magistrate, Gaya
7. The District Welfare Officer, Gaya

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Chandra Mishra

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Tiwary

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 22-01-2016

Heard the parties.

In the present case, petitioners were engaged as
Multipurpose Rehabilitation Worker since April 2007.

At the instance of the Central Government, the State
Government has introduced the scheme of rehabilitation to the

handicapped person of the State. The Advertisement was published on 15th October 2006. In pursuance thereof, petitioners applied for the aforesaid post.

According to the said Notification, engagement was made for one year in the consolidated amount of salary.

As per the petitioners, the scheme of rehabilitation have continued upto 2007 though they were working but it has been communicated that the scheme has been closed.

The State counsel submits that the scheme was initiated on the basis of Grants provided by the Central Government as it is a Social Security Scheme, generally gets Grants from the Central Government. If such Grants is dried, the State Government does not have sufficient funds to continue such scheme. If any Grants comes, the State Government will either re-introduce the scheme or bring a fresh scheme.

Petitioners have only limited prayer that whenever such scheme is reintroduced, their cases should be considered and they should be engaged for such scheme.

This Court disposes of this writ application with a direction that whenever such scheme comes and petitioners apply for their engagement, the authority concerned will consider their past experience and will try to accommodate them, subject to fulfillment of

the condition that will be mentioned in the relevant document.

With the above observation/direction, this petition is

disposed of.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Mahesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--