

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2379 of 2019

1. Dr. Mohammad Perwez, Late S.M. Raquib Resident of Chandwara, Hall Saheb Compound, Police Station- Muzaffarpur Town, District Muzaffarpur at present near Bailgum Bhavan, Tarkeshwar Parg, Police Station Kankarbagh, District- Patna
2. Dr. Ashok Kumar Deokuliar, Shri Raghunath Prasad Resident of Kameshwar Niwas, Mohalla- Thakurwari near Idgah, Dharm Samaj Road at, post and Police Station Chatauterwa, Motihari, District- East Champaran.
3. Dr. Santosh Kumar, Late Dr. Surendra Kumar Resident of 234 B Belavanwar, Police Station Motihari Town, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, East Champaran
5. The Executive Director, State Health Society, Bihar, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The District Health Society, East Champaran through Civil Surgeon-cum-Member Secretary.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dinu Kumar, Advocate Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Nagendra Prasad Yadav, SC-23 Mr. S N Singh, AC to SC-23
For the Respondent No. 5	:	Mr. K K Sinha, Advocate Mr. Shashi Shankar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 11-11-2024 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners have preferred the writ petition for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus seeking a direction upon the concerned respondents to extend the period of contract



up to 70 years, as per the Government Resolution, admissible to the Doctors of Government of Bihar, vide Memo No. 1000 dated 10.07.2015, the copy of which is marked as Annexure-6 to the writ petition.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioners contended that the petitioners were serving on their respective post on contractual basis. However, despite the resolution issued by the Government, the benefit of extension has not been accorded to them.

4. Learned Advocate for the State, at the outset, submitted that all the three petitioners, who are before this Court, during the pendency of the writ petition, have already reached the age of 70 years and more than that and, as such, the writ petition has become infructuous.

5. In view of the submissions advanced and taking note of the fact that the petitioners have already crossed the age of 70 years, no fruitful purpose would be served to adjudicate the matter; the writ petition has become infructuous. Accordingly, the same stands dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

U			
---	--	--	--

