

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11463 of 2008

=====

Dasarath Ram, s/o late Ramrati Ram, r/o Mohalla-Gandhi nagar Veda, PS-Sasaram, Dist-Rohtas

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
 2. The Secretary-cum-Director, Nagar Vikas and Awas Department, New Secretariat, Bailey road, Patna
 3. The Deputy Secretary, Nagar Vikas, Awas Department, New Secretariat, Bailey road, Patna
 4. The District Magistrate, Rohtas
 5. The Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Sasaram, District-Rohtas
 6. The President, Nagar Parishad, Sasaram, District-Rohtas.... Respondent/s
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arbind Nath Pandey

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raisul Haque, SC-10

: Mr. Binay Kumar, AC to SC-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 25-07-2018

1. The petitioner, by way of the present writ petition, has prayed for grant of promotion to the post of Cashier Grade Assistant.

It has been stated in the writ petition that a seniority list was prepared in the year 1996 and the petitioner was at serial no. 22. It has further been stated that the petitioner was posted as Cashier at Nagar Parishad, Sasaram by an order dated 30.08.2002 and finally, the petitioner retired from the service w.e.f. 17.10.2005.

2. I have perused the materials on record. I find that the order dated 30.08.2002, by which the petitioner claims to have been posted as Cashier, nowhere stipulates that the petitioner has been posted as Cashier whereas the said order only provides that the concerned persons including the petitioner herein, whose names have



been mentioned in the said order, shall discharge the works which have been mentioned against their names. The respondents no. 5 and 6 have also filed a counter affidavit wherein, they have stated that there was no promotional avenues in the Municipality Rules on or before the date of retirement of the petitioner. It is further stated that the petitioner has been duly informed about inability of the municipality in considering the case of the petitioner for promotion on account of their being no promotional avenues in the municipality services. Lastly, it has been stated that no discrimination has been made since the petitioner has been treated equally like other employees of the municipality. From the writ petition, it is also apparent that the petitioner has failed to bring on record even one case to show that the said employee of the municipality has been granted promotion on the post of Cashier.

3. For the reasons mentioned hereinabove, I find that there is no material in the present petition, accordingly the same is dismissed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

rinkee/-

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

