

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18348 of 2024

1. Deva Nand Singh Son of Surendra Nath Singh, resident of Village-Sihauta Bangra, P.S.-Maharajganj, District-Siwan.
2. Vinay Kumar Srivastava, Son of Sita Ram Prasad, Resident of Hajiapur Ward No. 26, P.S.-Gopalganj, District-Gopalganj.
3. Vijay Prasad, Son of Late Bhola Prasad, Resident of Ward No. 7 Sah Tola Gurwalia, P.S.-Gopalganj, District-West Champaran.
4. Om Prakash Upadhyay, son of Late Sudama Upadhyay, Resident of Village-Gandhi Nagar, Ward No. 10 at east of V.M. field, P.S.-Gopalganj, District-Gopalganj.
5. Rudal Prasad, Son of Ram Lakhan Prasad, Resident of Hembardaha (Maniara), P.S. Kuchaikote, District-Gopalganj.
6. Satendra Kumar, son of Ram Gulam Ram, Resident of Village-Chandi Nalanda, P.S.-Chandi, District-Nalanda, BiharSharif.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Commissioner Saran Division, Saran at Chapra.
2. The Commissioner Saran Division, Saran at Chapra.
3. The Secretary of the Commissioner Saran Division Saran at Chapra.
4. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj.
5. The Additional Collector, Gopalganj.
6. The Circle Officer, Sadar, Gopalganj.
7. The Vigilance Officer, Departmental Inquiry Office, Gopalganj.
8. The Circle Officer, Kataiya, Gopalganj.
9. The District Election Officer, Gopalganj.
10. The District Development Officer, Gopalganj.
11. The Child Development Officer, Vijayipur, Gopalganj.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Pritish Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondents	:	Mr. Government Pleader 16

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-12-2024

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner Nos. 1,2 & 3 have challenged the



order bearing Memo No. 04-09/2020(ii) 1975 dated 09.09.2024 issued by the Secretary of the Commissioner, Saran Division, Saran whereby contractual employment of the petitioner Nos. 1,2 & 3 have not been extended despite recommendation made by the District Magistrate, Gopalganj vide Memo No. 735/establishment dated 24.07.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not pointed out any provision of law under which the respondent authorities are duty bound to extend the contractual services of the petitioner Nos. 1,2 & 3.

4. In that view of the matter, no writ in the nature of mandamus can be given to the respondents to extend the contractual services of the petitioner Nos. 1,2 & 3.

5. Insofar as petitioner Nos. 4,5 & 6 are concerned, there is prayer for direction to the respondents to take a final decision upon the recommendation bearing Memo No. 735 dated 24.07.2024 by the District Magistrate, Gopalganj.

6. As discussed hereinabove in respect of petitioner Nos. 1,2 & 3 that the learned counsel has not pointed out any provision of law which give them the right of extension of their contractual services, the learned counsel for the petitioners has also not been able to point out any provision of law whereby the



respondents could be under an obligation to extend the contractual services of the petitioner Nos. 4,5 & 6 on the basis of the recommendation dated 24.07.2024 made by the District Magistrate, Gopalganj.

7. Under the circumstances, I find that the petitioners do not have any legal right for extension of their contractual employment by the respondents.

8. The writ petition stands dismissed being devoid of merit.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Nishant/-

U			
---	--	--	--

