

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10574 of 2020

=====

Ajay Kumar Rai Son of Shatrughna Prasad Rai Resident of Village-
Khairatiya Balua, P.S.- Nawalpur, Dist.- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Engineer in Chief Public Health Engineering Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chief Engineer Public Health Engineering Department, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Superintending Engineer Public Health Engineering Circle, Motihari, Dist.- East Champaran.
6. The Executive Engineer Public Health Engineering Division, Bettiah, Dist.- West Champaran.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer Public Health Sub Division, Bettiah, Dist.- West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vaidehi Raman Prasad Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAG-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 11-01-2022

The matter is heard via video conferencing due to
circumstances prevailing on account of the COVID-19
pandemic.

2. In the instant petition, petitioner has prayed for
following reliefs:-

“1. That this is an application for
grant of an appropriate writ for a direction to
the respondents to reinstate the petitioner on
the Class IV post earlier held by him in work
charge establishment of Public Health



Engineering Department and to regularize him in regular establishment of the Department with effect from the date of his termination (31/12/2001) with all the consequential benefits including continuity of service in the concerned department.”

3. In the instant petition, petitioner has questioned the validity of his termination, as he is not in service as on this date. The termination is dated 13.12.2001/13.05.2002.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he had approached this Court earlier. At the same time, the same was not pointed out. The order of termination was set aside and directed the concerned respondent for reinstatement, if it is so, question of interference to termination order is not warranted.

5. If the orders passed by this Court was in the favour of petitioner, he has remedy of filing contempt of Court proceeding.

6. In these facts and circumstances, the petitioner has not made out a case. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

rakhi/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

