

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21551 of 2011

Kamlesh Prasad Pal S/O Late Janki Prasad R/O Village- Kosiyaara, P.S.- Hussainabad, District- Palamu (Jharkhand), at present - Deputation at Ranchi Range Forester, Minor Forest Produced Project, Ranchi Division, Chandawa Range, Latehar, Jharkhand

... .. 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 Chief Conservator of Forest-cum- Managing Director 13, Patliputra Colony, Patna
3. The Chief Conservator of Forest-cum- Managing Director, Bihar State Forest Development Corporation, 13, Patliputra Colony, Patna
4. The State of Jharkhand, through its Secretary, Department of Forest and Environment, Dorandea, 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. Saroj Kumar Sharma, AC to AAG-III.
For the BSFDC	:	Mr. R. K. Shukla with Ms. Ritu Raj Shukla, Advocates

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

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

2. Heard Mr. Saroj Kumar Sharma AC to AAG-III, representing the State and learned counsel for the Bihar State Forest Development Corporation (for brevity 'BSFDC').

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 records.

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. 2288 of 2016 vide order dated 05-09-2018.

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			
---	--	--	--

