

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5533 of 2025

=====

Sunil Kumar Sinha S/o- Late Munmun Prasad Sinha Resident of Village-
Lengar Kaikai, P.S.- Chenari, District-Rohtas, (Sasaram).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through The Chief Secretary Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Art Culture and Youth Bihar Patna.
3. Joint Secretary, Department of Art Culture and Youth Bihar Patna.
4. Deputy Secretary, Department of Art Culture and Youth Bihar Patna.
5. Director, Museum, Department of Art Culture and Youth Bihar, Patna.
6. Regional Deputy Director, Museum Department of Art Culture and Youth Bihar, Patna.
7. Curator Patna Museum, Patna.
8. Curator Chandradhari Museum, Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Shruti Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. K. P. Gupta, GP-10
		Mr. Virendra Kuar, AC to GP-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 07-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition has been filed to quash the letter contained in Memo No. 162 dated 23.10.2024, issued by the Director, Museum, Bihar, Patna (as contained in Annexure-22 to the writ petition), by which the petitioner's claim for regularization has been rejected.



3. Learned counsel for the State submits that from the letter contained in Annexure-22, it becomes crystal clear that the petitioner was previously moved before this Hon'ble Court, which directed the petitioner to represent before the authority. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was working as a daily wager and the provision for regularization is not available in his department.

4. After hearing the parties and upon perusal of the documents available on record, it transpires to this Court that there is no ground for interference in the present writ petition. Since the petitioner is a workman, his only remedy is to challenge the said order before the Labour Court. If the employer requires a person for the work similar to that of the petitioner, then under Labour Law, the petitioner's rights must be protected.

5. As such, the present writ petition stands disposed off, granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the Labour Court under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

