

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15055 of 2014

=====

Parmanand Rai Son of Late Prahalad Rai Resident of Hanuman Nagar
(Kankarbagh), P.O.- Patrakar Nagar, Police Station- Patrakar Nagar, District- Patna

.... **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Industry Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna
3. The Director, Technical Development Industry Department, Government of Bihar, Patna

.... **Respondents**

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents : Ratna Kumari, AC to PAAG

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 03-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for the State.

2. Instant writ petition has been filed for a direction to the
respondent authorities for regularization of the petitioner against the
post he is working.

3. Case of the petitioner is that he has been engaged on *ad hoc*
basis in 1983 and is in continuous engagement on the post of
typist in the Industry Department, Government of Bihar prior to cut
off date, i.e., 1.8.1995 and his case for regularization was earlier
considered by the Industry Department, Government of Bihar in its
meeting dated 26.8.1998 and a decision was taken in favour of
petitioner's regularization, subject to availability of the post in
accordance with roster.

4. It is the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner



that even said hurdle has now been cleared in view of roster clearance in light of order dated 17.9.2009, passed in L.P.A. No. 781 of 2009 (Annexure 18 to the second supplementary affidavit). He submits that many other similarly situated as the petitioner have already been regularized.

5. In view of submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, it would not be desirable to keep the instant petition pending for final decision regarding petitioner’s claim.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the matter may be disposed of directing respondent no.2 to take a final decision in respect of long pending claim of the petitioner in light of minutes of the meeting dated 26.8.1998 as also the roster clearance in this regard.

7. In view of the facts of the case, the petitioner is granted liberty to make a representation to respondent no.2 in this regard along with a copy of this order. If such representation is filed, respondent no.2 would be obliged to pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of eight weeks from the date of its receipt/production.

8. The writ petition is thus disposed of.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

Shashi.

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CA V DATE	NA
Uploading Date	9.7.2018
Transmission Date	NA

