

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10713 of 2023

=====

Jokhan Ram S/o Rekha Ram, Resident of Village-Penar, P.S.-Nokha, Distirct-Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Law Secretary, Department of Law and Justice, Govt of India, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, National Legal Service Authority, (NAZSA), 12/11, Jam Nagar House, New Delhi.
3. The State of Bihar through the Law Secretary, Govt. of Bihar. Patna.
4. The Secretary Bihar Legal Service Authority, Budh Marg, Patna.
5. The Secretary, District Legal Service Authority, Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Vikalp, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. AC to GP-2
For Union of India	:	Ms. Priyanka Raj Laxmi, Advocate
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr. Lala S.N. Rais, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-01-2024 Heard Mr. Vikalp, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned AC to GP-2 for the State and Mr. Lala S.N. Rais, learned counsel for Respondent No.3.

2. This writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondent authorities for selection of the petitioner as Para Legal Volunteer (P.L.V.) in the light of the order dated 03.11.2015 passed in L.P.A. No.3710 of 2015 reported in 2016 (3) P.L.J.R. 188 and in view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of State of Haryana Vs. Piara Singh reported in (1992) 4 SCC 118.



3. It appears that the petitioner was selected as Para Legal Volunteer by the District Legal Service Authority, Rohtas at Sasaram on two occasions for the period from 23.01.2020 to 05.02.2020 and from 26.03.2021 to 09.04.2021 vide Annexures 1 and 2 of the writ petition. Thereafter the petitioner has not been further selected to work as Para Legal Volunteer by any of the Legal Services Authorities.

4. From perusal of the decision rendered by this Court reported in 2016 (3) P.L.J.R. 188 and the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in (1992) 4 SCC 118, referred to by the petitioner, it is found that the aforesaid two decisions rendered by the Court does not have any relevance to the appointment of Para Legal Volunteer by the Legal Service Authority.

5. In the absence of the petitioner having been selected by the Legal Service Authority to work as Para Legal Volunteer, no direction to the respondents authorities, as sought by the petitioner in the instant writ petition, can be issued for appointment of the petitioner as Para Legal Volunteer.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition does not have any merit and the same stands dismissed.

7. Notwithstanding the dismissal of the writ petition,



the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the appropriate authority for appointment as Para Legal Volunteer, should the petitioner desire to work as Para Legal Volunteer with any of the Legal Service Authority.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Narendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

