

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22108 of 2011

=====

Jageshwar Prasad Son Of Ram Bhajan Ram Resident Of Village - Ghourdour,
P.S. -Lakhria, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary-Cum-Commissioner, Department of Health, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director in Chief, Health Services, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The Regional Deputy Director, Health Services, Patna Division, Patna
5. The Superintendent, Guru Gobind Singh Hospital, Patna City, Patna

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ganjendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sanjay Prasad, AC to AAG-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 20-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

By filing this writ application, the petitioner has sought quashing of Memo No. 400 dated 17.04.2003 as contained in Annexure '10' issued by the Regional Deputy Director, Health Services, Patna Division, Patna whereby and whereunder the petitioner has been terminated from service in the light of the order dated 25.10.2010 and 26.11.2010 passed in Case No. 65 of 2010 by One Man Enquiry Committee.

From the statements made in the writ application, it would appear that the father-in-law of this petitioner was a warer in the Mahila Swastha Paridarshika School, Patna City. He died



in harness. Upon his death, this petitioner being son-in-law was appointed as daily wage employee on compassionate appointment. The Hon'ble Mr. Justice (Retired) Uday Sinha being One Man Enquiry Committee was entrusted with the case of the petitioner by virtue of judicial order passed by this Court. The Committee found that this was only a backdoor appointment. The Government Circular does not contemplate this kind of appointment and the appointment of the petitioner had no sanctity of law. The order of the One Man Enquiry Committee as contained in Annexures '12' and 12/1' respectively are well-reasoned order which needs no interference.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to demonstrate any ground so as to warrant interference with the impugned orders.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

