

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15801 of 2019

-
1. Anuj Kumar Son of Jagdish Prasad Resident of Village- Hansepur, P.S.- Aungari, District- Nalanda.
 2. Ramkeshwar Prasad Son of Late Sahdev Mahto Resident of Village- Rampur, P.S.- Aungari, District- Nalanda.
 3. Dravi Kumari Wife of Shailendra Kumar Resident of Village- Rampur, P.S.- Aungari, District- Nalanda.
 4. Arun Kumar Son of Late Pyare Paswan Resident of Village- Kalyanpur, P.S.- Biharsharif, District- Nalanda.
 5. Anuj Kumar Sinha Son of Late Lakshmi Prasad Sinha Resident of Village- Dayamchak, P.S.- Sare, District- Nalanda.
 6. Hafiz Md. Umrez Azam Fahmi Son of Hajee Abdul Salam Resident of Mohalla- Chhaji Khari Kuan, P.S.- Biharsharif, District- Nalanda.
 7. Sunil Kumar Son of Late Brijnandan Prasad Resident of Mohalla- 35A, Main Road, Ashok Rajpath Sonalika Photo Stat, P.S.- Sultanganj, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate Nalanda.
5. The Principal Secretary Revenue and Land Reform Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Assistant Director Employment Exchange, Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Md. Shakir Ahmad, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Shiv Shankar Prasad (Sc8)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 13-08-2019

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that they are retrenched census employee and



their cases are covered by the judgment delivered in C.W.J.C. No. 145 of 2015 which has been disposed off on 12.03.2015 (Ranjan Rahul & Ors. Vs. the State of Bihar & Ors.).

3. Without going into the merit of the submission, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the concerned authorities to verify about the aforesaid averments of the petitioners and if it is found that the facts of the case of the petitioners are similar to the case of Ranjan Rahul (supra), then similar treatment be given to them. However, if it is found that the claim of the petitioners is not tenable because of any difference with respect to the factual position, thosw shall be taken into account and then only an order shall be passed.

4. Should such an application be filed by the petitioners for the aforesaid relief within a period of four weeks from today, the concerned respondents shall pass a reasoned order within a period of eight weeks thereafter.



5. With the aforesaid direction/observation, the writ petition stands disposed off.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	20.08.2019
Transmission Date	

