

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19565 of 2021**

=====

Satish Kumar Sharma, S/o Late Vinay Sharma, Village and Post-Saday Bigha,  
P.S.-Barahiya, District-Lakhisarai, and reading at present 606, Tara Tower,  
Shashtri Nagar, Patna-23.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Hon'ble Chancellor of Universities, Bihar, through the Secretary,  
Governor's Secretariat, Raj Bhawan, Patna-800022.
2. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education  
Department, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-  
800015.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of  
Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-800015.
4. The Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Mithapur, Patna-800001, through the  
Registrar, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Mithapur, Patna-800001.
5. The Vice-Chancellor, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Mithapur, Patna-  
800001.
6. The Registrar, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Mithapur, Patna-800001.
7. Mr. Ramjee Singh, R/o Vijay Nagar, Rukunpura, P.O.-B.V. College, P.S.-  
Rukunpura, Patna-800014, Near Sangam Enclave, presently posted as  
Finance Officer, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Mithapur, Patna-  
800001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar Srivastva, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Shilpa Singh ( G.A.12 )

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR)**

(The proceedings of the Court are being conducted through Video Conferencing and the  
Advocates joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing from their residence.)

**Date : 06-01-2022**

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

“a. For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of

the mandamus or any other appropriate Writ(s), Order(s) or Direction(s) to quash the advertisement for the post of Finance Officer, issued by Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Patna, vide advertisement .No. 01 / 2019, dated 12.06.2019, Annexure -1 as the eligibility for the post of Finance Officer (Post No.-2) mentioned in this advertisement is in violation of the law contained in the provisions of the Section - 7(a) Chapter -I of the Statutes of Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Patna, states as the following;

**"7(a)The Finance officer shall be appointed by the Executive Council on recommendations of Selection Committee of the University either on deputation or by re-employment from amongst the officers of the office of the Accountant General, Bihar, Or Bihar Accountant Services Or Bihar Finance Services Bihar Or Bihar Services of Ole University".**

b. For issuance of a writ of Quo-Warranto against the Respondent No -7, requiring him to show his entitlement to hold the post of Finance Officer, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Patna, as he does not fulfil minimum eligibility criteria for the post of Finance Officer as defined in the provisions contained in Section -7(a) Chapter - I of the Statutes of the University.

c. For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of the mandamus or any other appropriate Writ(s) of certiorari to the Respondent No. 5, the Vice-chancellor of Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Patna, for setting aside the impugned notification memo no.003/Admn./02-07/AKU/2019-1756,dated 18.06.2020, Annexure-2, through which the Respondent No.7 was appointed as Finance Officer, is void, illegal and against provision of the statute and settled principal of law and/or set aside the said impugned notification memo no. 003/Adorn./02-07/AKU/2019-1756, dated 18.06.2020, Annexure-2 so

far as it relates to Respondent No.-7. Prior to his appointment to this post, the Respondent No.-7 was working as an Officer on Special duty on contract basis in a fixed remuneration. He was neither an officer in the office of the Accountant General, Bihar, nor an officer of the Bihar Accountant Services or an officer of the Bihar Finance Services. He was not having entitlement to become an applicant for the post of Finance Officer of the University. His appointment is void, illegal and against provisions laid down in the Section- 7(a), Chapter-I of the Statutes and also against the settled principal of law.

d. For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of the mandamus or any other appropriate Writ(s), Order(s) or Direction(s) to the Respondent No. 5, the Vice-Chancellor and the Respondent No.-6, the Registrar of the Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Patna, for recovery of the salary paid by the University to the Respondent no.-7 during the period from his date of joining i.e. 19.06.2020 to till date as his appointment is void, illegal and against provisions laid down in the Section- 7(a), Chapter-I of the Statutes and also against the settled principal of law.

e. For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of the mandamus or any other appropriate Writ(s), Order(s) or Directions(s) to the Respondent No.5, the Vice-Chancellor and the Respondent No. 6, the Registrar of the Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Patna, to withdraw all works from the Respondent no.7 during the pendency of this writ petition as his appointment is void, illegal and against provisions laid down in the Section 7(a), Chapter-I of the Statutes and also against the settled principal of law.

f. Any other relief or reliefs which may be deemed fit and proper by the Hon'ble Court in the facts and

circumstances of the case.”

The Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***D. N. Jeevaraj Vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka & Ors, (2016) 2 SCC 653***, paragraphs 34 to 38 observed as under:-

“34. The learned counsel for the parties addressed us on the question of the bona fides of Nagalaxmi Bai in filing a public interest litigation. We leave this question open and do not express any opinion on the correctness or otherwise of the decision of the High Court in this regard.

35. However, we note that generally speaking, procedural technicalities ought to take a back seat in public interest litigation. This Court held in *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.* [*Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.*, 1989 Supp (1) SCC 504] to this effect as follows: (SCC p. 515, para 16)

“16. The writ petitions before us are not inter parties disputes and have been raised by way of public interest litigation and the controversy before the court is as to whether for social safety and for creating a hazardless environment for the people to live in, mining in the area should be permitted or stopped. We may not be taken to have said that for public interest litigations, procedural laws do not apply. At the same time it has to be remembered that every technicality in the procedural law is not available as a defence when a matter of grave public importance is for consideration before the court.”

36. A considerable amount has been said about public interest litigation in *R&M Trust* [*R&M Trust v. Koramangala Residents Vigilance Group*, (2005) 3 SCC 91] and it is not necessary for us to dwell any further on this except to say that in issues pertaining to good governance, the courts ought to be somewhat more liberal in entertaining public interest litigation. However, in matters that may not be of moment or a litigation essentially directed against one organisation or individual (such as the present litigation which was directed only against Sadananda Gowda and later Jeevaraj was impleaded) ought not to be entertained or should be rarely entertained. Other remedies are also available to public spirited litigants and they should be encouraged to avail of such remedies.

37. In such cases, that might not strictly fall in

the category of public interest litigation and for which other remedies are available, insofar as the issuance of a writ of mandamus is concerned, this Court held in *Union of India v. S.B. Vohra* [*Union of India v. S.B. Vohra*, (2004) 2 SCC 150: 2004 SCC (L&S) 363] that: (SCC p. 160, paras 12-13)

“12. Mandamus literally means a command. The essence of mandamus in England was that it was a royal command issued by the King's Bench (now Queen's Bench) directing performance of a public legal duty.

13. A writ of mandamus is issued in favour of a person who establishes a legal right in himself. A writ of mandamus is issued against a person who has a legal duty to perform but has failed and/or neglected to do so. Such a legal duty emanates from either in discharge of a public duty or by operation of law. The writ of mandamus is of a most extensive remedial nature. The object of mandamus is to prevent disorder from a failure of justice and is required to be granted in all cases where law has established no specific remedy and whether justice despite demanded has not been granted.”

38. A salutary principle or a well-recognised rule that needs to be kept in mind before issuing a writ of mandamus was stated in *Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India* [*Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India*, (1974) 2 SCC 630] in the following words: (SCC pp. 641-42, paras 24-25)

“24. ... The powers of the High Court under Article 226 are not strictly confined to the limits to which proceedings for prerogative writs are subject in English practice. Nevertheless, the well-recognised rule that no writ or order in the nature of a mandamus would issue when there is no failure to perform a mandatory duty applies in this country as well. Even in cases of alleged breaches of mandatory duties, the salutary general rule, which is subject to certain exceptions, applied by us, as it is in England, when a writ of mandamus is asked for, could be stated as we find it set out in *Halsbury's Laws of England* (3rd Edn.), Vol. 11, p. 106:

‘198. *Demand for performance must precede application.*—As a general rule the

order will not be granted unless the party complained of has known what it was he was required to do, so that he had the means of considering whether or not he should comply, and it must be shown by evidence that there was a distinct demand of that which the party seeking the mandamus desires to enforce, and that that demand was met by a refusal.'

25. In the cases before us there was no such demand or refusal. Thus, no ground whatsoever is shown here for the issue of any writ, order, or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution."

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, states that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to the authority concerned i.e. (Respondent No. 5, the Vice-Chancellor, Aryabhatta Knowledge University, Mithapur, Patna-800001) to consider and decide the representation which the petitioner shall be filing within a period of four weeks from today for redressal of the grievance(s).

Learned counsel for the respondents states that if such a representation is filed by the petitioner, the authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously and preferably within a period of four months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order.

Statement accepted and taken on record.

As such, petition stands disposed of in the following

terms:-

(a) Petitioner shall approach the authority concerned within a period of four weeks from today by filing a representation for redressal of the grievance(s);

(b) The authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously by a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a period of four months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order;

(c) Needless to add, while considering such representation, principles of natural justice shall be followed and due opportunity of hearing afforded to the parties;

(d) Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law;

(e) We are hopeful that as and when petitioner takes recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available in law, before the appropriate forum, the same shall be dealt with, in accordance with law and with reasonable dispatch;

(f) Liberty reserved to the petitioner to approach the Court, if the need so arises subsequently on the same and subsequent cause of action;

(g) We have not expressed any opinion on merits. All

issues are left open;

(h) The proceedings, during the time of current Pandemic- Covid-19 shall be conducted through digital mode, unless the parties otherwise mutually agree to meet in person i.e. physical mode;

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Interlocutory Application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(Sanjay Karol, CJ)**

**( S. Kumar, J)**

Rajiv/veena-

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| AFR/NAFR          |  |
| CAV DATE          |  |
| Uploading Date    |  |
| Transmission Date |  |