

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17766 of 2008

=====

Md. Izhar Alam, son of Late Md. Chhatharu Mian, resident of Village- Chhitahi
Hanuman Nagar, P.S.- Bhaitiyahi, District- Supaul.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Collector –cum- Chairman, District Establishment (Appointment)
Committee, Supaul.
3. The Commissioner, Kosi Division, Saharsa.
4. The Civil Surgeon –cum- Chief Medical Officer, Supaul.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Lala Sachindra Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar Sinha 2, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Shankar, AC to GP-2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 12-04-2017

Heard Mr. Lala Sachindra Kumar, learned counsel
appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Gyan Shankar, learned
Assisting Counsel to Government Pleader No.2 for the State.

The petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents to
make appointment from the panel which is stated to have been
prepared as back as in the year 2000. In other words, the panel so
prepared in the year 2000 is sought to be enforced after a long lapse
of 8 years and except that a refuge is taken under the representation
filed, there is no other explanation.

Mr. Lala Sachindra Kumar, learned counsel appearing for
the petitioner very fairly has invited the attention of this Court to



the supplementary affidavit enclosing two orders of this Court in which the coordinate Benches while not granting indulgence to the prayer so made by similarly placed panelist did direct the District Magistrate, Supaul to take steps for regular appointment within a period of one year failing which he was restrained from taking work from the daily wages appointees. According to Mr. Lala Sachinda Kumar, the situation has not improved and remains thus.

In the circumstances so discussed, I am not persuaded to grant indulgence to the prayer so made more particularly in the nature of the relief prayed, the delay in approaching the Court and the order enclosed at Annexures 9 and 10 of the supplementary affidavit. Accordingly the writ petition is disposed of in terms of the order passed at Annexures 9 and 10.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	17.04.2017
Transmission Date	NA

