

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 13754 of 2014

=====

Mangal Manjesh Manav Son of Jai Mangal Prasad Sharma resident of village Azmatpur, P.S. Baranti Rajapakar, District Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through Secretary, Human Resources Department
2. National Insurance Company Limited, through its Managing Director, Registered Office-3, Mddlton Street, PO Box No 9229 Kolkata
3. Chief Regional Manager, National Insurance Company Sone Bhawan, Third Floor, Patna-1 National Insurance Company Limited

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : M/s Shrinandan Pd Singh, Naresh Nandan, Advs
For the Respondent/s : Mr Ashok Priyadarshi, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 03-09-2019

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned counsel for the respondent-Company.

2 Petitioner participated in the process of appointment for Administrative Officer in the respondent-Company. It is his case that 3% reservation for physically handicapped was not applied in the process of selection. He has asserted that no person from the category of physically handicapped was selected for appointment.

3 The respondents, on 14.08.2019, served a copy of the counter affidavit on the learned counsel for the petitioner and filed



the same in the instant proceedings specifically submitting in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the counter affidavit, that three persons had been appointed in the physically handicapped category. The entire details have been disclosed in the counter affidavit as to what were the marks of the candidates under physically handicapped category and who were appointed in the process of selection. It is submitted that since the other physically handicapped persons have already filled up the vacancy, this writ petition has become infructuous. Earlier, when the matter was listed on 27.08.2019, the matter had been adjourned to enable the petitioner's counsel to place on record a rejoinder or reply, if so required. Today again, when the matter is listed, prayer is made for adjournment to verify the said facts whether the details disclosed in the counter affidavit are correct or incorrect.

4 Writ petition has been filed in the year, 2014. Copy of the counter affidavit has been served on the learned counsel for the petitioner on 14.08.2019. Specific averments have been made in the counter affidavit by the respondent-Company with details as to the candidates selected against physically handicapped category with reference to their merits/marks obtained in the process of selection. In spite of opportunity granted earlier, no rejoinder or reply has been filed. This Court is not inclined to grant further



time to the learned counsel for the petitioner as copy of counter affidavit on petitioner's counsel has already been served on 14.08.2019.

5 Writ petition is, therefore, found to be infructuous in view of the appointments made in the meantime and also considering the fact that the process of selection is one of April, 2014.

6 Writ petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	11.09.2019
Transmission Date	NA

