

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6649 of 2018

1. Subhash Kumar Rai and Anr Son of Ram Ekbal Rai, Resident of Near Police Line, Chhota Telpa, Chapra, Police Station- Muffasil, District- Saran.
2. G.B. Navin, Son of Sri Gautam Singh, Resident of Mahadeva Road, Siwan, P.O.- Siwan, Police Station- Muffasil, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The General Manager, Central Bank Of India and Ors
2. The Chief Manager, Central Bank of India, Zonal Office, Human Resources Development HRD, Recruitm
3. The Assistant General Manager, Central Bank of India, Human Resources Development HRD, Recruitmen
4. The Chief Manager/Assistant General Manager, Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Siwan at prese

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Sinha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

4 04-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, counsel for the State and counsel for the Bank.

2. This writ petition has been filed for directing the respondent Bank for appointment of the petitioners on the post of Safai Karamchari-cum-Sub-Staff in the department of Central Bank of India.

3. Counsel submits that he has appeared in the advertisement published in daily newspaper, Dainik Jagran on 18.10.2012. They have appeared up to the interview which was held on 14.03.2013 but appointment letter has not been issued.



But in the meantime, the petitioners have received information that similarly situated person has moved Hon'ble Guwahati High Court in WP(C) No. 3781 of 2014 which was disposed off on 14.03.2016 in which the relief which was allowed in favour of the petitioners of the said WP(C) No. 3781 of 2014 and the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLA No. 26673-26674/2017, the same was dismissed against the Bank. Counsel for petitioner submits that petitioners are ought to be considered in the light of the said decision made by Hon'ble Guwahati High Court approved by Hon'ble Supreme Court and in this background appointment letter may be issued to the petitioners.

4. Counsel for the Bank on the other hand submits that the case of the petitioners and case of petitioners of Guwhati are different. He submits that the petitioners who moved in writ petition before the Guwhati were the casual worker whereas the present petitioner are the fresh persons who need appointment on the basis of advertisement.

5. Counsel further submits that similarly situated persons has moved before this Court in different writ petitions. One of such persons has moved in C.W.J.C. No. 1666 of 2014 and C.W.J.C. No. 19524 of 2014 against which L.P.A. was filed i.e. L.P.A. No. 449 of 2016 and L.P.A. No.460 of 2016 which



were challenged before Hon'ble Supreme Court as S.L.P No. 22164 of 2017 and the said L.P.A. was dismissed and no relief was granted to the persons situated as like that of petitioners.

6. Counsel for petitioners submits that there are some Civil Review pending before this Hon'ble Court but those review are relating to casual worker and not for the persons who were demanding fresh appointment.

7. In the light of the submissions made by the parties as well as order contained in L.P.A. No. 449/2016 and L.P.A. No. 460 of 2016 as well as in the light of S.L.P. (C) No. Diary 38240 of 2018 and S.L.P. (C) No. 22164 of 2017, this Court is of the firm view that there is no case of the petitioners and the relief prayed by them cannot be granted.

8. As such, this writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

