

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1474 of 2017

-
-
1. Manoj Kumar @ Manoj Kumar Pandey, Son of Ramadhar Pandey, resident of Village- Rahsi, P.S.- Bochhan, District- Muzaffarpur.
 2. Ganesh Kumar Siddhu, Son of Sunil Kumar, resident of Village- Haripur, Panchayat- Jamalpur- Kodai, P.S.- Gaighat, District- Muzaffarpur.
 3. Anil Mahto, Son of Nawal Mahto, resident of Village- Kuaahi, P.S.- Baruraj, District- Muzaffarpur.
 4. Ajay Kumar, Son of Yugeshwar Ram, resident of Village- Kuaahi, P.S.- Baruraj, District- Muzaffarpur.
 5. Srikant Ram, Son of Nagina Ram, Resident of Village- Chhipuliya, P.S.- Baruraj, District- Muzaffarpur.
 6. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Son of Prahlad Singh, Resident of Village- Barji, P.S.- Motipur, District- Muzaffarpur.
 7. Yogesh Kumar, Son of Sunil Lal, resident of Village- Jarang Baluaha, P.O.- Jarang Dyodhi, P.S.- Gaighat, District- Muzaffarpur.
 8. Sanjay Kumar Kushwaha, Son of Ramchandra Kumar Kushwaha, resident of Village- Jagdishpur Kushahi, P.S.- Motipur, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Planning and Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Planning, Economics and Statistics Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Joint Director, Economics and Statistics Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Collector, Muzaffarpur.
6. The District Statistical Officer, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Block Development Officers of Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : None

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 14-11-2019 The petitioners claim that they were appointed as

Accredited Statistical Volunteers in 2013. It is their grievance



that after 06.06.2016, no work is being taken from them.

On perusal of the pleadings in the writ application, I find that the petitioners have not been able to make out any case of their legal right to continue after 06.06.2016. It is the petitioner's case that no order of termination has been served on them.

The question is whether such order was required at all to be served on the petitioners as the petitioners have failed to establish their right to continue beyond the date up to which they had worked.

There is no merit in this application, which is accordingly dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Rajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

