

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12924 of 2010

=====

Jai Lal Prasad S/O Mahavir Prasad R/O Vill.-Sugauna,P.S.- Rahika,Dist.-
Madhubani ,At Present Posted As Junior Engineer,Road Construction
Department,Road Sub-Division, Sikandra-Jamui.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Chief Secretary, Bihar,Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Bihar,Patna.
4. The Engineer - In - Chief-Cum Additional Commissioner-Cum-Special Secretary, Road Construction Department.
5. The Chief Engineer , Road Construction Department (South Bihar Wing),Patna.
6. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department ,East Bihar Circle, Patna.
7. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department , Road Division, Jamui.
8. The Assistant Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Sub Division, Sikandra ,Jamui.
9. The Principal Secretary, Rural Engineering Organization, Bihar, Patna.
10. The Engineer-In-Chief Cum Additional Commissioner Cum Special Secretary, Rural Engineering Organization, Bihar, Patna.
11. The Chief Engineer, Rural Engineering Organisation (Middle Bihar), Patna.
12. The Superintendent Engineer, Rural Engineering Organization , Gaya Circle, Gaya.
13. The Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Organisation, Works Division, Aurangabad.
14. The Assistant Engineer, Rural Engineering Organisation, Works Sub Division, Daudnagar, Aurangabad.
15. The Executive Engineer, N.R.E.P. (National Rural Employment Programme), Madhubani

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Md. Hussamuddin Azad, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Saroj Kr. Sharma, AC to AAG-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 13-12-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

In the present case, the petitioner has submitted that the



case of the present petitioner is identical to the case of Indradeo Pandit who has approached this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 13456 of 2011 and he should also be given the identical benefit which has been conferred by this Court to Indradeo Pandit.

In view of the above, let the Authority should examine the case of the petitioner vis-à-vis Indradeo Pandit.

If the Authority finds that both the cases are identical, in such circumstances, whatever benefit has been given to Indradeo Pandit, the same will also be extended to the petitioner of this case.

With the aforementioned observation and dirrection, this writ application is disposed of.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Rishi/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	15.12.2017
Transmission Date	NA

