

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2551 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 17563 of 2015

- =====
1. Choudhary Basudeo Prasad, son of late Choudhary Gyan Prasad, resident of mohalla-Alkapuri, P.S.-Gardanibagh, District-Patna, at present retired Section Officer in Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
 2. Nageshwar Prasad, son of late Nand Kishore Rai, resident of mohalla-Saristabad West Tola, P.S.-Gardanibagh, District-Patna, at present Under Secretary in Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
 3. Amir Lal Singh, son of late Rajendra Prasad, Resident of Mohalla-Beur, P.S.-Beur, District-Patna. At present Under Secretary in Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Anjani Kumar Singh the Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
2. Amir Subhani, the Principal Secretary, Department of General Administration, Bihar, Patna.
3. Kesav Prasad Singh, the Deputy Secretary, Department of General Administration Bihar, Patna.
4. Bihar Public Service Commission through its Alok Kumar Sinha the Chairman, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. Prabhat Kumar Sinha, the Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Avinash, Adv.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Adv.

For the State : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-7

For the BPSC : Mr.Sanjay Pandey, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

2 14-09-2018

Reason for rejection of the claim of the petitioners

for promotion may be good or bad, but the fact remains that the learned Writ Court has not adjudicated upon the claim of the petitioners with regard to their entitlement. The only direction was issued to consider the case of the petitioners which has been done



in the present case.

Annexure-A to the show cause is the minutes of the meeting dated 24.05.2016 of the Bihar Public Service Commission. Annexure-B is the notification of promotion in respect of the two petitioners. The petitioner no.1 has not been granted promotion for the reasons shown in Annexure-A.

This contempt application seems to have become infructuous. It is disposed off accordingly, but with liberty to the petitioner no.1 to agitate his claim in an appropriate application and in an appropriate jurisdiction.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

