

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6402 of 2023

=====

Umesh Kumar Mandal Son of Akhileshwar Mandal, resident of Ward no. 2,
Palasmani Bhirbhiri, District - Araria, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Bihar Land Reforms and Revenue Department,
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Land Records Survey and Land Measurement, Directorate,
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Secretary, General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.P.K. Shahi, AG

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 08-08-2023

The writ petition in the nature of a Public Interest Litigation is filed to cancel the selections made to the post of Amins published as on 10.04.2023 by the Bihar Land Reforms and Revenue Department, Government of Bihar, Patna on its website. The petitioner alleges that an online examination was conducted because of which meritorious students could not get job and those who illegally participated in the examination were



appointed. This is an unsubstantiated allegation made with abject levity and callousness.

2. The petitioner also has stated that there are about 400 Amins working on contract basis and a list of 136 such contractual employees has been given in the memorandum of writ petition. Some of the appointment letters of the candidates now selected are also produced as Annexure-2. The petitioner also has a contention that weightage marks for experience is added in the final list of selections, made to the other departments, whereas no such provision was available in the appointment of Amins.

3. It is not clear as to whether the petitioner is agitating a public cause or the cause of the contractual employees. There is absolutely no public cause, we discern from the averments, which merely speak of an illegal online exam without stating as to what illegality was committed. As far as weightage to contractual employees, the same has to be agitated by them individually and cannot be agitated as a public interest before this Court. Further, even according to the petitioner there was a selection process conducted and persons appointed to the posts; none of whom are impleaded herein.

4. We find absolutely no reason to invoke the



extraordinary jurisdiction based on the sketchy averments made in the writ petition.

5. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Anushka/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	11.08.2023
Transmission Date	

