

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21490 of 2011

Mukhi Nath Dubey S/O Late Bharat Dubey R/O Vill.- Radhiya, P.S.- Govindpur, Distt.- East Champaran, at Present- Forester, Minor Forest Produced Project, Ranchi Division, Nakchatra Van, Governor House, Ranchi.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Principal Secretary, Department of Forest and Environment, Sinchai Bhawan, Old Secretariat, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Bihar State Forest Development Corporation, through its Managing Director 13, Patliputra Colony, Patna
3. The Managing Director Bihar State Forest Development Corporation, 13, Patliputra Colony, Patna
4. The State of Jharkhand, through its Secretary, Department of Forest and Environment, Doranda, Ranchi (Jharkhand).
5. The Jharkhand State Forest Development Corporation Hinoo Chowk, Ranchi, through the Managing Director.
6. The Managing Director, Jharkhand State Forest Development Corporation, Hinoo Chowk, Ranchi, Jharkhand

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	None
For the State	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, AC to GA-IX
For the BSFDC	:	Mr. R. K. Shukla with Ms. Ritu Raj Shukla, Advocates
For the Jharkhand State	:	Mr. M.N. Roy, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 23-02-2023 None appears for the petitioner.

2. Heard Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh AC to GA-IX, representing the State, learned counsel for the Bihar State Forest Development Corporation (for brevity 'BSFDC') and learned counsel representing the Jharkhand State.

3. It is apparent from the order dated 18-10-2011 (Annexure-3) that the Departmental Promotion Committee (for



short 'DPC') did not find the petitioner eligible for promotion.

4. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent Nos. 5 and 6. The counter affidavit of respondents claims the decision of the Committee to be founded on the record.

5. Earlier, on account of non-appearance of the petitioner's counsel, the matter was dismissed for default on 18-05-2016. It has, therefore, been restored in proceedings arising out of M. J. C. No. 2286 of 2016 vide order dated 07-02-2018.

6. Today, when the matter is called, again, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Without expressing any opinion on the above observations, taken from the records, the writ application is dismissed for want of prosecution.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

shyambihari/-

U			
---	--	--	--

