

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1033 of 2020

=====

Shri Narayan Singh, Son of Late Ramayaga Singh, Resident of Village-
Maharani Bairiya, Tarkauliya, P.O.- Jasuali Patti, P.S.- Kotwa, District- East
Champaran. Presently posted as Peon, Mahesh Prasad Sinha Science College,
B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar,
Patna.
4. The Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The B.R. Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur through its Registrar.
6. The Vice Chancellor, B.R. Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Registrar, B.R. Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
8. The Finance Officer, B.R. Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
9. The Principal, Mahesh Prasad Sinha Science College, B.R. A. Bihar
University, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jagjit Roshan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Roy 1 (SC-13)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

2 18-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the State
and the University.

The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ
petition is that contrary to the policy decision, the respondent
University is not granting benefit of counting of service to the
petitioner from the initial date of appointment.

Counsel appearing on behalf of the University
submits that the petitioner has earlier approached this Court for



the same relief and vide order dated 28.10.1999 passed in CWJC No. 8896 of 1998, Annexure-4 to the writ petition, the claim was rejected. He further submits that by office order dated 25th February 2006, Annexure-6 to the writ petition policy decision was taken by the University only to the extent that the benefit of service from initial date is available only for the purpose of pension. The petitioner is still in job and therefore the present writ petition is totally misconceived and pre-mature. The policy decision as contained in Annexure-6 is for the purpose of counting the services of the petitioner for pensionary benefit and for no other purpose.

Considering the aforesaid submission, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the University as and when he has a cause of action for implementation of Annexure-6.

With the aforesaid, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

spandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--

