

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6061 of 2019

1. Shambhu Prasad, Son of Baijnath Prasad, R/o Mohalla-Dakhin Darwaza, P.S.-Chand Chaura, District-Gaya
2. Ajay Kumar, Son of Mahavir Prasad, R/o Village-Bhane Bigha, P.S. Makhdumpur, District-Jehanabad
3. Krishna Kumar, Son of Hari Singh, R/o Village-Sikhar, P.S. Manpur, District-Gaya
4. Dhanwanti Kumari, D/o Tulsi Prasad R/o Village-Bitho Sharif, P.S. Chanauti, District-Gaya
5. Alok Kumar Sinha Son of Late Shardha Prasad Lal R/o Village-Bitho Sharif, P.S. Chanauti, District-Gaya
6. Ramayan Pandit, Son of Raghubir Pandit, R/o Mohalla-Bahadurpur Housing Colony, Janta Flat, Block No. 2, Quarter No. 52, P.S.-Agamkuan, District-Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Commissioner, Magadh Range Gaya
3. The District Magistrate Cum Collector Gaya
4. The Deputy Collector, Establishment Gaya Collectriate, Gaya

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurendra Kumar, AC to Gp5

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-04-2019

Heard Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, learned advocate

for the petitioners and Mr. Dhurendra Kumar, learned AC

to GP 5.

2. The petitioners had approached this Court vide

CWJC No. 11384 of 2008, being strengthened by the



judgment delivered in the case of Sanjay Singh Vs. the State of Bihar and Ors. (CWJC No. 17766 of 2009), seeking a direction to the respondent authorities for appointing them on Class IV post in the district of Gaya on the ground that they had been empaneled in the earlier panels prepared but the appointment was being made from a new panel which was prepared pursuant to an Advertisement No. 1 of 2004, in which the names of the petitioners did not figure. The petitioners were, in the aforesaid circumstances, given the permission to make a representation before the concerned respondent for verifying why their names did not figure in the new panel and such representation was directed to be disposed off within a stipulated period of time.

3. When the objections were not disposed of by the concerned respondent, a contempt petition was filed vide MJC No. 802 of 2013. The petition was not heard for some time for the pendency of Civil Appeal No. 4789 of 2016, which was taken up for consideration after the



disposal of the aforementioned Civil Appeal in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court had permitted the candidates/aspirants therein to make a representation to the State Government for grant of relaxation of age within a month of the passing of the order and which representation was directed to be considered sympathetically by passing appropriate favourable orders, taking into account the available vacancies in Class IV posts. Taking clue from the aforesaid permission/concession granted to the candidates, the petitioners were also given the permission to represent before the authorities with a direction that they be given the same treatment as was ordained in the order passed in Civil Appeal No. 4789 of 2016.

4. It is the case of the petitioners that their representations are still pending and have not been acted upon. It has also been argued on behalf of the petitioners that a fresh panel has been prepared in which their names do not figure.



5. This court, under the aforesaid circumstances only directs that the representations which have already been filed before the concerned respondent regarding consideration of the case of the petitioners, be disposed off by a reasoned order as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

6. With the aforesaid direction/observation, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	20.04.2019
Transmission Date	

