

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16109 of 2024

=====

Lav Kumar Singh, Son of Manoj Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-Bithalpur,
Ward No. 17, Nagar Parishad, P.S. and District Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, Jamui.
3. The Additional District Magistrate, Jamui.
4. The Circle Officer, Jamui.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Satya Prakash Parasar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rajeshwar Singh, GA-10
		Mr. Jitendra Kumar, AC to GA-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-10-2024 Heard Mr. Satya Prakash Parasar, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Jitendra Kumar, learned counsel for the

State.

2. The petitioner who has been working as a driver
against the sanctioned and vacant post since last ten years has
approached before this Court seeking a direction upon the
respondents to consider his case for regularization against any
suitable Class-IV post in any of the department of the State of
Bihar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that
despite the fact that the petitioner has been discharging his duty
with utmost satisfaction of the authorities concerned, his claim



for regularization has not been considered, though the persons who have been later on inducted in the department, their services have been considered for regularization causing discrimination. It is fairly contended that earlier the petitioner had come before this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 3004 of 2016 for the identical relief(s), but the same came to be dismissed on account of non-prosecution on 28.09.2019.

4. At this juncture, learned counsel for the State submitted that without there being any rule, regulation and the scheme for regularization, the relief(s) sought for by the petitioner is wholly misconceived. Moreover, the petitioner had already approached before this Court and the writ petition stood dismissed, though on account of non-prosecution.

5. Having heard the learned counsels for the respective parties and taking note of the contention of the petitioner to the effect that the claim of the other identical persons have been considered for regularization ignoring the claim of the petitioner, this Court deems it fit and proper to dispose off the writ petition with a liberty to the petitioner to approach before the authority concerned by filing an appropriate representation.

6. In case, the department finds that the case of the



other identically situated persons have been considered for regularization, the same must be done in the case of the petitioner, if there is any rule and regulation allow for the consideration of regularization of the petitioner.

7. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

