

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12102 of 2015

Along with

Interlocutory Application No. 392 of 2018

=====

Binod Bihari Shrivastava (B. B. Shrivastava) Son of Late Chaturbhuj Prasad,
Resident of Naviganj, Chapra, P.S. and District- Chapra.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Vikash Bhawan, Patna.
3. Jai Prakash University, Chapra, through its Registrar, District- Saran at Chapra.
4. The Registrar, Jai Prakash University, Chapra, District- Saran at Chapra.
5. The Vice-Chancellor, Jai Prakash University, Chapra, District- Saran at Chapra.
6. The Finance Officer, Jai Prakash University, Chapra.
7. Baba Saheb Bheem Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur, through its Registrar, District- Muzaffarpur.
8. Registrar, Baba Saheb Bheem Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.
9. Vice Chancellor, Baba Saheb Bheem Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shubh Narain Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Shankar Prasad, A.C. to G.P. 14
For the Respondents No. 7 to 9	:	Mr. Anil Singh, Advocate
For the J.P.U. Chapra	:	Mr. Nagendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 17-02-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; State; J.P.

University and B.R.A. Bihar University.

Re.: Interlocutory Application No. 392 of 2018

2. The present Interlocutory Application has been filed
for amendment of the writ petition to challenge Annexure-2, which is



the order dated 03.05.2014 passed by the Registrar of B.R.A. Bihar University.

3. The Court finds that such amendment cannot be allowed and the petitioner cannot become wiser after four years. The writ petition has been filed in the year 2015 and Annexure-2 had been brought on record by the petitioner himself in the main writ petition. However, challenging the same belatedly and I.A filed only on 17.01.2018, in the opinion of the Court, is not fit to be allowed.

4. Accordingly, the same stands dismissed.

Re.: Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12102 of 2015

5. From the pleadings on record, it appears that the retiral benefits of the petitioner, which is admissible and due to him, as per the present situation, has been paid to him.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

