

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19818 of 2018

-
1. Raghuvir Kumar, S/o Bhagwati Charan Karn, Resident of Village-Thatia, P.O.P.S.-Rosara, Distt.-Samastipur
 2. Kanchan Kumari D/o Ram Lakhan Tkhakur Resident Mohalla-Bahadurpur ward No.26 Kanti Bhawan, P.S. Distt.-Samastipur
 3. Phool Mohammad S/o Md. Ilyas Karan Resident of Village -Gonhar Nawada, P.O. Kharajjitwarpur P.S. Distt.-Samastipur
 4. Alkha Bharti D/o Rajesh Kumar Mahto, W/o Sanjay Kumar Mahto Resident of Village-Ramganj Kali Asthan P.O.P.S.-Lalbag, Distt.-Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Mission, Director Lohia Swachha Bihar Abhiyan, Patna
3. The State Co-ordinator Rural Development Department, Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Samastipur
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner Samastipur

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Bhushan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Harish Kumar -GP-8

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 11-04-2019

Heard Mr. Amresh Kumar Sinha, learned counsel

for the petitioner and Mr. Harish Kumar, learned GP-8, for the State.

2. The petitioners were appointed on contract for three years for working in the Committee of cleanliness and were primarily entrusted with the job of making villages under their control and jurisdiction to be open



defecation free. After completion of three years, they were asked to stop working in the capacity in which they had hitherto been working.

3. This Court has not been able to understand as to what has aggrieved the petitioners when they have only been asked to stop doing their work on the completion of their tenure.

4. Perhaps a fresh selection process for temporary appointment has begun which has aggrieved the petitioners because in case other suitable candidates are found in the process, the petitioners would loose their opportunity of a further extension on account of good appraisal of the services rendered by them for the entire period of the tenure.

5. This is no ground for stopping the selection process. The situation would have been different if a temporary appointment/ad hoc appointment would have been sought to be replaced by another temporary appointment/ arrangement. The selection of the petitioners



was only on contract for three years and they performed for three years.

6. There is no reason why this Court should interfere in the fresh selection process, which has been initiated.

7. There is no merit in this writ petition. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed.

8. It need not be stated that in case the petitioners so desire and if they are eligible, they can apply for being considered in the fresh selection process.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

sanjeev/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16/04/2019
Transmission Date	NA

