

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1437 of 2018

-
-
1. Arun Kumar, S/o Bharat Lal Sah, Resident of Village- Tola Lalpatti Block Road, P.S.- Triveniganj, District- Supal.
 2. Manoj Kumar, S/o Late Dharadev Kamat, R/o Village Post- Nagar Parishad, Supaul Ward No.24, P.S. and Anchal- Supaul, District- Supaul.
 3. Md. Jawed Alam, S/o Md. Allauddin, R/o Village and Post- Chainsingpatti, P.S. + District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Deputy Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Kosi Division, Saharsa.
4. The District Magistrate cum Collector cum Chairman Selection Committee, Supaul.
5. The District Establishment Department, Supaul, District- Supaul.
6. The D.D.C., Supaul.
7. The Deputy Collector cum In-Charge Director, D.R.D.A., Supaul.
8. The Treasury Officer, Supaul.
9. The District Land Acquisition, Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shekhar Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Raja Surendra Mohan, Advocate Mr. Budhi Lal Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Manish Kumar -GP4

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

5 04-10-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.

2. The present petition has been filed for quashing the order impugned issued vide Memo No. 890-2 dated 05/10/2017 by respondent No.4, namely, the District Magistrate-cum-



Collector, Supaul.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that for appointment on the post of Class-IV panel list prepared on 26.08.2017, from the various departments in the light of Government Circulars on the basis of advertisement No. 01/2014, published in the daily newspaper. The establishment Nazarat has also prepared the panel list for appointment on Class IV vacant post, but there is discrepancy made in the said appointment list for appointment of Class IV vacant post as the same have been prepared in gross violation of the law.

4. Counsel for the petitioners has specifically mentioned in paragraph 13 of the writ petition that candidates whose names have appeared in the D.R.D.A. panel list and in the hospital panel list have been appointed for the post of IVth Grade employees against the vacant post. According to the petitioners, both the D.R.D.A candidate and the candidate of the hospital panel list do not come in the category of Collectoriast staff, whereas the appointment Committee has treated the persons from D.R.D.A panel list and hospital panel list as clerical staff. This is the main grievance of the petitioners but the petitioners have not specifically pleaded in the pleading that who are those candidates whose selection have been made from



the list of D.R.D.A. and from the list of hospital panel. Counsel for the petitioners has also not made parties respondents to them in the present writ petition.

5. In this view of the matter, that the pleading of the writ petition is not complete and proper persons were not made a party to the writ petition, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present writ petition.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed, granting liberty to the petitioners to raise the grievances afresh, if so advised, but after collecting the names of all the persons who have allegedly selected/appointed wrongly and also after making representation to the authority concerned afresh.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

