

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9535 of 2017

1. Lal Babu Ram, son of Rajendra Ram, resident of At- Yarpur Ambedkar Colony, Khagaul Road, P.O.- Gardanibagh, Police Station- Gardanibagh, District- Patna.
2. Indu Mistri, son of Sri Ramkrit Mistri, resident of Village- Chhata, P.O.- Chhata, P.S.- Masaurhi, District- Patna.
3. Suresh Thakur, son of Late Chamari Thakur, resident of- Biharsharif, Ramchandarpur, P.S.- Laheri, P.O.- Bharaupar, District- Nalanda.
4. Prashant Kumar, son of Akal Pandit, resident of Village-Behrawan, P.O.- Shorampur, P.S.- Pipra, District- Patna.
5. Mahesh Ram, son of Tota Ram, resident of At- Patna City Hospital, Behind LHV School in the Quarter, P.S.- Khajekala, District- Patna.
6. Lalan Prasad, son of Sri Sumangal Yadav, resident of Village- Nadaul Golapar, P.S.- Masaurhi, District- Patna.
7. Rajesh Kumar, son of Late Saryug Prasad Ray, resident of At- Shri Krishna Nagar (Chakaram), Near Kabirstan, P.S.- Budha Colony, District- Patna.
8. Anil Kumar, son of Late Lala Prasad, resident of At- Langar Toli Kali Mandir, Awlas Lane, P.S.-Kadam Kuan, District- Patna.
9. Arjun Razak, son of Late Sitaram Razak, resident of At- East Sipara Bathani Par, P.S.- Jakkanpur, District- Patna.
10. Ganesh Mallick, son of Late Bhola Mallick, resident of At- Kankarbagh Tempo Stand, Haijan Tola, P.S.- Patrakar Nagar, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, (Higher Education), Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chairman, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Alok Kumar, Adv.
For the B.S.E.B.	:	Mr. Shyam Shankar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 26-09-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the Respondent -Bihar School Examination Board



(for brevity ‘ the Board’).

Rejoinder is being filed which is taken on record.

It is submitted by the petitioners’ counsel that their contractual existence in the respondent-Board has been extended further. In view thereof, the petitioners’ does not wish to press this application anymore. He, however, submits that the petitioners’ would be approaching the Authorities with a representation for taking some decision to regularize the petitioners’ having regard to the long services rendered by them on contractual basis.

Learned counsel for the Respondent-Board, on the other hand, has submitted that, as of today, there is no policy of regularization in the Board for contractual employees.

The writ application is disposed of.

Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the petitioners’ claim for regularization, the Court would observe that the petitioners are always at liberty to move to the Authorities for relief in accordance with law.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

