

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23797 of 2012

=====

Rakesh Kumar S/o Sri Shyam Nandan Prasad Srivastava C/o Bajrang Bhawan, Rajendra Prasad Lane, Sheikhpura, P.S- Shastri Nagar, District/ Town, Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Urban Development Department, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Urban Development Department, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. Bihar Urban Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd Through Its Managing Director, 303, 3rd Floor, Maurya Tower Maurya Lok Complex, Budh Marg, Patna- 800001
4. Managing Director, Bihar Urban Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd., 303, 3rd Floor, Maurya Tower, Maurya Lok Complex, Budh Marg, Patna- 800001.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Prasad Singh, Advocate.
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Shalini, AC to GP-5.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 24-09-2024 Heard Mr. Mukesh Prasad Singh, learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Ms. Shalini, learned

AC to GP-5 for the State.

2. The petitioner in paragraph no. 1 of the present writ

petition has sought, inter alia, following relief(s), which is

reproduced hereinafter:-

“1. That this is an application for issuance of writ in the nature of writ of mandamus directing respondents Bihar Urban Infrastructure Development Corporation Ltd. (herein after referred to as "BUIDCO") to select and re-appoint the petitioner to the post of Deputy Projector Director against one of the 21 vacant posts after allowing the petitioner's application for withdrawal of resignation in the backgrounds of the facts mentioned in the



present writ application and particularly in view of the fact that the petitioner is one of the most efficient and experienced Mechanical Engineer who has already acquired experience by earlier working on the post of Deputy Project Director in the BUIDCO.

And for any other writ / writs, direction / directions as deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. Considering the statement made in Para-7 of the counter affidavit and the facts which are contained in the writ petition and the order of termination which is simplicitor in nature and the petitioner having applied afresh pursuant to the advertisement dated 15.12.2011 and his candidature was rejected considering that he had crossed the maximum age limit, I don't find any reason to interfere in any manner to grant relief to the petitioner.

4. The writ petition is dismissed.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

mantreshwar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

