

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12608 of 2015

-
-
1. Sarita Kumari wife of Mithilesh Kumar, resident of Mohalla- Ward No. 17, Hajipur, P.S.- Khagaria, District- Khagaria
 2. Ashok Kumar, son of Prashuram Sah, Resident of village- Ranko Dih, Ward No. 12, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Khagaria
 3. Neeraj Kumar, son of Panchlal Prasad singh, Resident of village- Icharua, P.O.- Amba, P.S.- Alauli, District- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Health Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Department of Health, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate cum President Indian Red Cross Society District Branch Khagaria
4. The Secretary, Indian Red Cross Society, District Branch Khagaria, through District Magistrate Cum Chairman, Khagaria
5. The Medical Officer, In charge Blood Bank, Sadar Hospital, Khagaria

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binod Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kamlesh Kishore, AC to SC 12

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 20-12-2022 Though the present writ petition was filed challenging the notice published in the Newspaper on 31.07.2015, by the District Magistrate-cum-President, Indian Red Cross Society, District Branch Khagaria, inviting applications for making appointment on the post of Lab Technician on contractual basis at the Blood Bank, Sadar Hospital, Khagaria, however, the learned counsel for the respondent- State has submitted by referring to the counter affidavit filed in the present case that though the petitioners



were appointed on contractual basis as Lab Technicians but their services were not found satisfactory, hence their contractual appointment was cancelled, whereafter, the Advertisement in question was published on 31.07.2015. It is further submitted that the petitioners had again applied and appeared in the Walk-in Interview held on 10.08.2015 and after completion of the selection process, petitioners no. 2 and 3 have again been selected, however the petitioner no. 1 could not be selected.

In such view of the matter, nothing survives for consideration in the present writ petition, since the selection process is over, apart from the fact that since the petitioners no. 2 and 3 have already been appointed, the present writ petition *qua* them has been rendered infructuous.

Having regard to the aforesaid stand taken by the respondent State, I do not find any merit in the present writ petition, hence, the same stands dismissed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

rinkee/-

U			
---	--	--	--

