

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2707 of 2019

=====

Pramod Kumar S/o Late Bujhawan Thakur, Resident of Village- Madhaul,
P.O.-Susta Madhopur, P.S.-Kudhani (O.P.-Turki), District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Commissioner Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur
4. The District Magistrate Muzaffarpur
5. The Principal Secretary Revenue and Land Reform Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
6. The Assistant Director Sub-Regional Employment Exchange, Muzaffarpur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Diwakar Prasad Karn, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sheo Shankar Prasad (SC-8)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 24-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court, seeking a direction upon the respondent-authorities to appoint him on Class-IV post in pursuance to advertisement published by respondent-District Magistrate by taking into consideration that the petitioner was a retrenched employee of 1991 census.

3. To support the claim as prayed for in the present writ petition, it is contended that the Government has taken a policy decision and resolved that in case of available vacancies, the retrenched census employees shall be considered by granting



them one time age relaxation subject to fulfillment of further criteria.

4. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of Respondent Nos. 4 and 6.

5. Learned Advocate for the State referring to the counter affidavit has contended that in due process, a final panel was prepared and published in the year 2011, out of which eligible candidates were selected and appointed against vacancies according to the roster. Though the panel is valid only for one year, but in compliance with the order of this Court passed in different matters, a meeting of District Level Selection Committee was held on 13.02.2017 for appointment on the post of Group D for different financial years. A time bound action plan was made and published on notice board for claim and objection, if any. It is the specific contention of the respondent-authorities that the petitioner did not turn up to file claim/objection, as such the revised panel was published on 06.03.2017.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts, it is thus contended that petitioner is not entitled for the reliefs prayed for in the present writ petition.

7. Considering the submissions advanced and the



averments made in the counter affidavit as also the nature of relief, the writ petition stands closed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anushka/-

U			
---	--	--	--

