

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10407 of 2014

=====

Amit Kumar Son of Anil Kumar Singh, Resident of Village- Nirpur, P.S.
Dhamdaha, District- Purnea

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Agriculture Production Commissioner, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Agriculture Production Commissioner, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Department of Agriculture, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Purnea
5. The District Agriculture Officer, Purnea
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Dhamdaha, District- Purnea
7. The Block Agriculture Officer, Dhamdaha, District- Purnea

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Suresh Kumar, AC to GP 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 28-11-2017

Heard counsels for the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner was engaged as 'Kishan Salahkar' who advises farmers for obtaining loan and other agriculture related activities. The appointment was on contractual basis for a period of one year. During subsistence of the contract one of the persons who took advice from the petitioner lodged an FIR saying that the petitioner has demanded commission from loan which was being sanctioned to him in lieu of advice given by him. In light of such allegation, the petitioner was caught red handed near the Central Bank



of India where the said person was also present to receive the first installment of loan. Having considered the allegation, the petitioner was disengaged. The order of disengagement dated 02.05.2014 has been challenged by the petitioner.

It appears that the period of contract as submitted by the counsel for the petitioner was for the period of one year which has already elapsed.

Keeping in view the nature of grievous allegation and the fact that the petitioner was caught red handed as also the fact that by virtue of time lapse the contract period has lapsed, this Court finds no merit in the petition. The same is accordingly, dismissed.

It goes without saying that if the petitioner applies for such scheme in future, the same shall be considered in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the dismissal of the case.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

Prakash/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	02.11.2017
Transmission Date	

