

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18923 of 2021

=====

Rangnath Singh Son of Bhola Singh, resident of Village Dhawan, P.O.-
Durgadih, P.S. Bikramganj (Rohtas), Bihar.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Department of Higher Education, Government Bihar, Patna.
3. The Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara through its Vice Chancellor.
4. Sri Rajendra Kumar Singh, the Vice Chancellor, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara, Bihar.
5. Sri Dharendra Kumar Singh, the Registrar, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara, Bihar.
6. The Anjabit Singh College, Bikramganj (Rohtas) (A Constituent unit of Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara) through the In-charge Principal.
7. Doctor Santosh Kumar Singh, In-charge Prinicipal, Anjabit Singh College, Bikramganj (Rohtas) (A Constituent unit of Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara).

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Binay Kumar, Advocate Md.Mannan Khan, Advocate
For the University	:	Mr.P.N.Shahi, Sr. Advocate Mr.Ritesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent No. 7:		Mr.Abhinav Srivastava, Advocate Mr.Gyan Shankar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Jai Prabhat Kishore, AC to SC-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

6 29-08-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Senior Counsel for the Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara (hereinafter referred to as the ‘University’) and learned counsel for the State.

2. By filing this writ application the petitioner has questioned the order of the Vice Chancellor of the University contained in Memo No. 1641/Estab/2021 dated 16.08.2021



issued by the Registrar of the University by which Respondent No. 7 who is an Assistant Professor has been appointed as In-charge Principal of Anjabit Singh College, Bikramganj (Rohtas) by cancelling the earlier Notification No. 1769/Estab/18 dated 12.07.2018 by which Dr. Sudhanshu Shekhar Bhaskaram was appointed as Professor In-charge of the said College.

3. At the outset, learned Senior Counsel for the University submits that the petitioner has no *locus standi* to maintain this writ application. It is submitted that the petitioner has no individual cause of action and he seems to have brought this application by way of a Public Interest Litigation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to demonstrate as to how the petitioner can maintain this writ application. It is worth taking note that the petitioner is not praying for a Writ of Quo Warranto.

5. In the given circumstance, this writ application cannot be maintained, it is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

tusharika/-

U			
---	--	--	--

