

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.365 of 2017

In

LPA 827 of 2015

=====

1. Arvind Kumar, Son of Late Lakhpat Sharma, resident of Rahul Nagar,
P.O.- Khabra, P.S.- Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
 2. The Principal Secretary Cum Agriculture Production Commissioner,
Department of Agriculture, Vikas Sachivalaya, Patna, Bihar.
 3. The Director, Department of Agriculture, Vikash Sachivalaya, Patna,
Bihar.
 4. The Director, Administration, Department of Agriculture, Vikash
Sachivalaya, Patna, Bihar.
 5. The Principal Secretary Cum Commissioner, Cabinet Vigilance
Department, Government of Bihar, Suchana Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna,
Bihar.
 6. The Director General, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Patna, Bihar.
 7. The Joint Director Agriculture, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
 8. The District Agriculture Officer Combined Building, Muzaffarpur.
 9. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
 10. Ram Pukar Singh, Kalambagh Road, Muzaffarpur through then
Agriculture Production Commissioner Sri A.K. Sinha, Present chief
Secretary, Bihar Respondents
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rakesh Narayansingh, Adv.
For the Respondents : Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh, AAG XIII
Mr. Ravi Kumar, AC to AAG XIII

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR
UPADHYAY**

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

4 17-01-2018 While disposing of L.P.A. No. 827 of 2015 on
21.08.2017 we refused to interfere in the matter only on the
ground that the case of the petitioner for promotion could not be
considered as he was facing vigilance case, at the time of hearing
of Letters Patent Appeal.

We are informed that the vigilance case has been
disposed of. However, from the documents, brought on record by
the petitioner vide Annexure 2 dated 16.02.106 and Annexure 3



dated 03.03.2016, it is seen that the vigilance case was closed and no action was taken against the petitioner.

If that is so, we direct to the petitioner to file certified copy of this order along with the relevant documents that he has been exonerated in the vigilance case.

The respondents are directed to consider the case of the petitioner and take decision within a period of three months and communicate it to the petitioner.

With the aforesaid modification, this applications stands disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

SA/-

U			
---	--	--	--

