

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3685 of 2017

=====

Sd. Mohammad Ansari, aged about 65 years, Son of Late Fakir Bakhs Ansari,
Resident of Shivnath Dham Apartment, Patna-6

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary Higher Education Bihar, Patna
2. Governor of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Raj Bhawan, Bihar

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Archana Sinha, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey, AAG-15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 22-03-2017

In this petition filed *pro bono* petitioner seeks for reconstitution of the Search Committee for purpose of deciding afresh the question of appointment of Vice Chancellors in various universities in the State of Bihar. Further direction is sought for to cancel the appointment of the newly appointed Vice Chancellors and Pro Vice Chancellors by contending that the due process has not been followed in appointment of the Vice Chancellors.

2. Matter pertains to appointment of Vice Chancellors to various universities based on a Search Committee constituted by the Chancellor of the university. Except for contending in Paragraph 10 that appointments have not been properly made and junior



candidates have been appointed without granting opportunity to the senior candidates, this petition has been filed in public interest.

3. Even though learned counsel for the petitioner during the course of hearing vehemently argued that the appointment made is not in accordance with law, we are not inclined to go into the question in this petition pertaining to appointments to the posts in question at the instance of the petitioner based on vague and unspecified allegations made in the writ petition so also in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Bholanath Mukherjee Vs. Ramakrishna Mission Vivekanand Centenary College (2011) 5 SCC 464**. In fact, the matter is akin to a service matter, and in cases like this, indulgence in a Public Interest Litigation is not called for.

4. Accordingly, finding no case for interfering into the matter at the instance of the petitioner, we dismiss the writ petition.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

P.K.P.

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	28.03.2017
Transmission Date	

