

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4848 of 2022

=====

Ramesh Choudhary Son of Amarnath Choudhary Resident of Village-
Khaurana Jairam P.S.Kurhani (Turki O.P.) District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Life Insurance Corporation of India through the Executive Director (Personnel) Central Office, Jivan Bima Marg, Mumbai.
2. The Zonal Manager, L.I.C. of India, East Central Zonal Office, Jeevan Deep, Exhibition Road, Patna.
3. The Senior Divisional Manager, L.I.C. of India, Divisional Office, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Senior Branch Manager, Carrier Agent Branch (CAB), L.I.C. of India, P.S. Kazi Mohammadpur, Kalambagh Road, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pramod Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Om Prakash, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 09-11-2023 1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief(s):-

“1. That this is an application for issuance of a Writ in nature of Certiorari to quash the letter dated 4/02/2020 issued under the signature of the Senior Divisional Manager, L.I.C Divisional Office, Ramana Muzaffarpur whereby and whereunder a direction has been issued to the In-charge of all Branches that newly recruited Assistants are joining by tomorrow and they are sufficient in numbers for every Branch so any arrangement either throughout-sourcing or any other means shall cease with immediate effect. And consequent upon the said direction the petitioner



has been restrained from working as permanent daily wages Peon in CAB, Muzaffarpur. And further for issuance of a Writ in the nature of Mandamus commanding and directing the respondent authorities to appoint/regularise the services of the petitioner on the post of Peon in any Branch of Muzaffarpur in the Life Insurance Corporation as the petitioner is not only working for last fifteen years as permanent daily wages Peon in the CAB Branch Muzaffarpur but also participated in the Selection process of Peon and has become successful but due to the mistake on the part of the respondents the petitioner would not be appointed, so, till the appointment/regularisation the petitioner may be allowed to work as daily wages employee for which the petitioner is legally entitled to.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to approach the respondent-authorities for redressal of his subsisting grievances, if any. Liberty so sought is granted.

3. The writ petition stands disposed off as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

sonal/-

U			
---	--	--	--

