

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5710 of 2012

=====

NIRANJAN KUMAR SINHA Son Of Mahendra Prasad Resident Of Mohalla Pathratta, P.S. Sheikhpura, District-Sheikhpura, At Present 3/M.F. 4/20, Bahadurpur Housing Colony, P.S. Agamkuan, District-Patna-800026

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE HOUSING BOARD through Secretary, Bihar State Housing Board, Patna.
2. Managing Director, Bihar State Housing Board, Patna
3. The Secretary, Department Of Housing Board, Bihar, Patna
4. Deputy Secretary, Department Of Personal And Administrative Reforms, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
5. Deputy Secretary, Department Of Housing Board, Bihar, Patna
6. The Secretary, Department Of Building Construction Deptt., Govt. of Bihar, Patna
7. The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Housing Board Patna Division No.1, Lohia Nagar, P.S. Lohia Nagar, District-Patna
8. The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Housing Board, Patna Division No.2, Bahadurpur, P.S. Agamkuan District-Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Devendra Kr Sinha Aag2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

5 21-12-2019 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner is seeking direction to the respondents to regularize his service in work charge establishment against a Class-IV vacant posts in the Bihar State Housing Board and further to allow him to continue as a work charge employee as he had been performing the duties as work charge employee for more than 21 years.



3. The age of the petitioner has been described as 53 years in the affidavit portion of the writ application. This application was filed in March, 2012. The petitioner has apparently thus, either crossed the age of 60 years or about to cross which is the age of superannuation.

4. The averment in the writ application also gives an indication that no work was being taken from him on the date of filing of the writ application in 2012. However, there is no averment that the petitioner was engaged after undertaking any process of selection through advertisement.

5. For the reasons noted above, I do not find any merit in the writ application.

6. This writ application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

S.Ali/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

