

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5211 of 2011

=====

Arbind Kumar Sri Chandeshwar Mahto Tarper, P.O. Chiksaura, Via
Hilsa, P.S. Hilsa, Distt. Nalanda

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director in Chief Health Services,
Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna
2. The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
3. The Civil Surgeon Cum Chief Medical Officer, Katihar, Distt.
Katihar
4. The Medical Officer, Falka, District - Katihar

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Nandan Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sanjay Pandey, GP21

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 19-01-2018

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

2. The petitioner, in the present case, is seeking quashing of the order dated 16.12.2010 passed by Hon'ble Justice Sri Uday Sinha, One Man Committee, in the Case No. 151/2010 (Arbind Kumar Vs. State of Bihar and Others).

3. The said One Man Committee was constituted in terms of the order and direction issued by a Division Bench of this Court in L.P.A. No. 1623/2009 and its analogous cases vide judgment and order dated 11.02.2010, as



contained in Annexure-14 of the writ application.

4. In terms of the direction of the Hon'ble Division Bench, the petitioner was given an opportunity of hearing. After going through the materials available on the record, it was found that the petitioner had claimed his appointment on the basis of a forged letter of appointment. The Committee has recorded that in fact when he was called upon to support the legitimacy of his appointment, he did not assert that he had been appointed by Civil Surgeon, Daltonganj and that the appointment letter was not a forged document.

5. The Civil Surgeon of Palamu has written to the Civil Surgeon, Katihar that the petitioner's appointment letter was forged, therefore, the Hon'ble Justice Sri Uday Sinha Committee has held that the services of the petitioner was rightly terminated by Annexure-11 dated 23.06.2003.

6. In view of the finding recorded by One Man Committee and in absence of any challenge to the procedure adopted by the said Committee in course of adjudication, as per direction of this Hon'ble Court, this Court, sitting in its writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, would not take upon itself the role of a fact finding



body.

7. This writ application requires no interference. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

Rajeev/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	19.01.2018
Transmission Date	NA

