

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2099 of 2020

=====

Kausal Kumar Son of RamaNand Paswan Resident of Village- Ubadhi, Police
Station- Karghar, P.O.- Kaniyari, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General, Vigilance Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara through its Registrar.
5. The Vice- Chancellor, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara.
6. The Governing Body of Badri Narain College, Indore, District- Rohtas,
through its Secretary.
7. The Principal, Badri Narain College, Indore, District- Rohtas.
8. The Director General of Vigilance, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Apurva Kumar, Advocate
For Respondents 6 & 7	:	Mr. Rajesh Prasad Choudhary, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 22-03-2024

The specific contention of the respondents 6 and 7
(the College), is that the petitioner was a person who had not
been selected when he offered himself as a candidate, as an



Economics lecturer. It is also pointed out that earlier the petitioner had come with a writ petition which was rejected as per Annexure-R7/A.

2. The petitioner, however, submits that he was employed in the College and he was thrown into the streets.

3. We see that a number of allegations are made against the respondents 6 and 7 (the College) and the specific contention is that a Vigilance enquiry should be conducted insofar as the payments made to the teaching and non-teaching staff of the College. None of these persons are impleaded in the writ petition even in the representative capacity.

4. The petitioner also is trying to agitate his personal cause before this Court as we discerned from the specific arguments addressed by the learned Counsel that he was working in the College and that he was dismissed from service.

5. The factum of the earlier writ petition filed was also suppressed from this Court, in the purported public interest litigation. We are unhappy with the manner in which the petitioner has filed the public interest litigation and we are inclined to dismiss the case with exemplary cost. At which juncture, the learned Counsel for the petitioner sought withdrawal of the writ petition.



6. We permit withdrawal of the writ petition with caution to the petitioner not to repeat such misdemeanor of agitating personal causes and settling personal scores by filing PILs.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	28.03.2024.
Transmission Date	NA

