

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7159 of 2010

=====

HARISHCHANDRA JHA, S/O RAM KISHUN JHA, R/O VILLAGE -
GADHA, P.S.- RUNISAIDPUR, DISTRICT- SITAMARHI.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR.
2. THE ADDITIONAL SECRETARY, WATER RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT,GOVT. OF BIHAR,SINCHAI BHAWAN,PATNA-1.
3. THE COMMISSIONER CUM SECRETARY,WATER RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT,GOVT. OF BIHAR,SINCHAI BHAWAN,PATNA-1
4. THE ENGINEER IN CHIEF (NORTH BIHAR),WATER RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT,GOVT. OF BIHAR,SINCHAI BHAWAN,PATNA-1.
5. THE CHIEF ENGINEER, WATER RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT,SINCHAI BHAWAN,PATNA-1.
6. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, TIRHUT
PRAMANDAL,WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT,SINCHAI
BHAWAN,PATNA-1.
7. THE CHIEF ENGINEER, INCHARGE,NORTH BIHAR, WATER
RESOURCES DEPARTMENT,MUZAFFARPUR.
8. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, TIRHUT
PRAMANDAL,MUZAFFARPUR.
9. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,BAGMATI PRAMANDAL,
SHIVHAR.
10. THE AWAR PRAMANDAL PADADHIKARI,BAGMATI AWAR
PRAMANDAL,SHIVHAR.
11. DHANRAJ RAI, S/O NATHUNI RAI, R/O VILLAGE- BHISA, P.S.-
DUMRA, DISTRICT-SITAMARHI.
12. RAM SIHASAN RAI, S/O RAJGIR RAI, R/O VILLAGE- AMGHITTA,
P.S.- DUMRA, DISTRICT-SITAMARHI.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. S.K. Thakur, Adv. Mr. Alok Kumar Jha, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Neeraj Raj, AC to GA8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 12-03-2018

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

In this case, the petitioner has made a prayer for
regularization in service.



Earlier the petitioner had moved before this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 12766 of 1993 and this Court refused to entertain in the same and a liberty was given that if the petitioner applies against the future advertisement, his case will be considered and if he is found eligible and suitable, the age bar, in his case, shall be relaxed, whereafter, the Collectorate, Muzaffarpur published a communique and one of the conditions was mentioned that those who are in service on daily wages, they can apply against the vacancy. The petitioner was not in service at that relevant time but, those who were in service, their cases were considered and some of them were also regularized in service, so the notification was not applicable to the petitioner and, as such, his case was not considered for appointment/regularization in service in the 4th grade post.

In that view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in the present case and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	14.03.2018
Transmission Date	NA

