

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.266 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10649 of 2016

-
-
1. Renu Devi Wife of Chottan Ram Resident house of Bishnu Yadav, Prakashpuri Sapna Cinema Road, Panchratan Gali P.S.-Nawada, P.O.-Sheoganj, Ara, District- Bhojpur, Bihar.
 2. Roushan Ram @ Raushan Kumar Son of Chottan Ram Resident house of Bishnu Yadav, Prakashpuri Sapna Cinema Road, Panchratan Gali P.S.-Nawada, P.O.-Sheoganj, Ara, District- Bhojpur, Bihar.
 3. Rohit Kumar Son of Chottan Ram Resident house of Bishnu Yadav, Prakashpuri Sapna Cinema Road, Panchratan Gali P.S.-Nawada, P.O.-Sheoganj, Ara, District- Bhojpur, Bihar.
 4. Manshi Kumari Daughter of Chottan Ram Resident house of Bishnu Yadav, Prakashpuri Sapna Cinema Road, Panchratan Gali P.S.-Nawada, P.O.-Sheoganj, Ara, District- Bhojpur, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through Shri Baiyadnath Yadav, the Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Dr. Shailendra Kumar Chaturvedi, Vice- Chancellor, Veer Kuwar Singh University, Ara through its Registrar
3. Dr. Ranvijay Kumar, Registrar, Veer Kuwar Singh University, Ara.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Additional Advocate General 13

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 05-04-2024 Heard Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rajesh Prasad Choudhary representing Veer Kuwar Singh University (Opposite Party No. 2 & 3).

2. The writ Court had directed the University to consider the case of the husband of the petitioner as he should be given the same benefit as has been given to Md. Sahabuddin.

Mr. Choudhary had provided the copy of the notification no. 362/2024 dated 22.02.2024 issued under the signature of the Registrar of the said University by which amongst other the name of the husband of the petitioner has also been accepted and have been approved w.e.f. 09.07.1950.

3. Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that though his services have been accorded, certain benefits has not flown, as was done in the case of Md. Sahabuddin.

4. An order has been passed the services of the petitioner has been approved, if the petitioner grievance is that certain benefits which was accorded to Md. Sahabuddin has not been extended to petitioner’s father, it is advised to prefer a writ petition.

5. The M.J.C. No. 266 of 2024 stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

anuradha/-

U			
---	--	--	--