

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1214 of 2009

- =====
1. Sanjay Kumar Charan son of Sri Nagendra Srivastwa, resident of village – Kartaha, Police Station – Kartaha, District – Vaishali.
 2. Chandra Shekar Azad son of Sri Mahendra Sah, resident of village – Taralahi, Police Station – Bahadurpur, District – Darbhanga.
 3. Sunil Kumar son of late Ram Lakhan Singh, resident of village – Mahendia, Police Station – Mahendia, District – Arwal.
 4. Dhananjay Kumar son of Sri Suresh Nandan Singh, resident of village – Ichhouse, Police Station – Islampur, District – Nalanda.
 5. Kamlesh Kumar son of Sri Ramji Prasad, resident of village – Naurojpur Police Station – Sare, District – Nalanda.
 6. Raj Kumar Prasad son of late Harihar Prasad, resident of village – Tharthari Bazar, Police Station – Tharthari Bazar, District – Nalanda.
 7. Muneshwar Prasad Shahni son of Sri Chedi Shahni, resident of village – Kansi Simari, Police Station – Simari, District – Darbhanga.
 8. Sheo Kumar son of Ram Kishore Shah, resident of village – Belsandi, Police Station – Chak Mahesi, District – Samastipur.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Agriculture Production Commissioner, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Director of Agriculture, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Deputy Director of Agriculture (Quality Control) Mithapur Farm, Patna.
7. The Deputy Director of Agriculture (Administration), Government of Bihar, Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Siya Ram Shahi

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5. 03-04-2017 Sri Siya Ram Shahi, learned counsel for petitioners fairly submitted that ofcourse, on interlocutory application, which was filed for allowing the intervenors to be impleaded as respondents, no order was passed, in the interlocutory application,



the intervenors have filed supplementary affidavit and the fact disclosed in the supplementary affidavit of the intervenors indicates that earlier advertisement was already cancelled and subsequently, the post was advertised. According to Sri Shahi, in view of subsequent advertisement, the present writ petition has become infructuous.

The writ petition stands dismissed as same has become infructuous.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--

