

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20767 of 2019

Pratish Kumar Sinha Son of Sri Mathura Prasad Singh residing at Mohalla-Mayur Vihar, Post Office- Bihar Vatnary College, Patna, Police Station- Rajiv Nagar, Town and District- Patna (800014).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar Human Right Commission through its Chairman, 9, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Bihar Human Right Commission, 9 Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Deputy Secretary, Bihar Human Right Commission, 9 Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Deputy Secretary (Establishment), Bihar Human Right Commission, 9 Bailey Road, Patna, Bihar.
5. The Section Officer, (Establishment), Bihar Human Right Commission, 9 Bailey Road, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Upendra Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2019 The petitioner is seeking a direction commanding Bihar Human Rights Commission to extend the period of his contractual appointment.

2. It is the petitioner's case that the he was engaged on contractual basis for a period of six months initially on 17.11.2011, which was subsequently extended for a further period of six months from time to time and last extension was allowed in April 2018. Thereafter the said engagement of the petitioner was not extended.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that though file was



moved for the petitioner's extension but for the reasons best known to the respondents, the period of his contractual appointment has not been extended. There is statement made in paragraph-18 of the writ petition that same and similarly situated employees have been allowed to continue and their contractual engagement has been extended.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that persons have been appointed against the same/ similar post, which the petitioner was holding but again on contractual basis and he contends that it is illegal to replace one set of contractual employees with another set of contractual employees.

5. On perusal of the pleadings in the writ petition, I find that the petitioner has not been able to make out a case establishing his right to hold any post after October 2018. This writ petition has been filed on 15.10.2019, nearly one year after the petitioner's contractual engagement came to an end. There is no clause in the agreement of contractual appointment that the said engagement was likely to be renewed. It is a different matter that the petitioner's engagement was renewed for a period of six months.

6. Since the petitioner has not been able to establish



any case of violation of legal or fundamental right, I am not inclined to grant the relief, which the petitioner is seeking.

7. This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

Rajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

