

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3656 of 2018

-
1. Kamal Narain Mandal, Son of Late Rajendra Prasad Mandal, Resident of Village and P.O.- Bhon Tekthi, Ward No. 06, Police Station and District- Madhepura.
 2. Braj Kishore Yadav, Son of Late Bhumi Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village- Barahi, Ward No. 07, P.O- Barahi Hasanpur, Police Station and District- Madhepura.
 3. Yadunandan Prasad Yadav, Son of Binchoo Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village- Parwaha, Ward No. 02, P.O.- Kaurhiharah, P.S.- Gamharia, District- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Vice Chancellor, B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura.
5. The Registrar B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura.
6. The Principal, B.N. Mandal Vanijya Mahavidyalaya, Madhepura.
7. Shyam Narain Yadav, Store Keeper, B.N. Mandal Vanijya Mahavidyalaya, Madhepura.
8. Sachindra Prasad Yadav, Son of Matar Yadav, Resident of Village- Sahugarh, Tola- Bhagawanpur, P.S. and District- Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.C.Mishra -Sc16

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 18-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents.

2. The grievance of these three petitioners is that they were appointed in the college in question on the post of Store Keeper, Lab Incharge and Peon and they claim that they are working regularly but neither they have been paid salary nor at any point of time any notification was issued for their absorption.



3. The names of these petitioners do not figure in the list issued by the State Government i.e. letter No. 25C. The petitioners claim that their names figure in the three-men committee report.

4. Considering the fact that the petitioners names do not figure in the letter No. 25C, they were not recommended either by Justice Agrawal Commission or Justice S.B.Sinha Commission and the fact that they were never paid salary after the college was made constituent unit, the Court is not in a position to accept their contention that they are regularly working against the sanctioned post.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the Court does not find any merit in the writ petition. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

spandey/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	20.07.2018
Transmission Date	

