

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.447 of 2023

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20387 of 2013

=====

Bikku Kumar Singh Son of Satruhan Singh, resident of Village - Dumari
Adda, P.S. - Doriganj, District - Saran at Chapra.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Animal and Fisheries, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The District Fisheries Officer-cum-Executive Officer, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Shiv Shankar Prasad Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Md. Khurshid Alam, AAG-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 01-07-2025

Heard Mr. Shiv Shankar Prasad Yadav,

learned Advocate for the appellant.

2. It appears that the appellant worked under a scheme for cleaning ponds, which was a contractual engagement. The scheme was later withdrawn.

3. All that the appellant wants is that a panel be prepared for all such contractual employees and their names should be included in the aforesaid panel from



which appointments on regular basis could be made.

4. We are afraid whether such a prayer can be allowed.

5. In fact, the appellant had claimed before the learned Single Judge that he would be entitled to be enlisted in the panel so that ultimately his name is considered for appointment on regular basis.

6. The learned Single Judge, taking note of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Mohd. Abdul Kadir & Anr. Vrs. Director General of Police of Assam & Ors., (2009) 6 SCC 611***, rejected the prayer of the appellants. Though, the above noted judgment was in respect of engagement in police service but the principles are the same, viz., that if a scheme had been in operation for some decades or that an employee concerned has continued on *ad hoc* basis for one or two decades, that alone would not entitle that employee to seek any permanency or regularization.

7. Going a step further, even preparation of



panel or enlisting a person in such panel would not be possible as panels are prepared for one year only.

8. There are no details about the year when the scheme under which the appellant had been working, ended.

9. Thus, there is no merits in this appeal and the same is dismissed.

10. We have made it cost easy only for the reason of the appellant being an unemployed person.

(Ashutosh Kumar, ACJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	01.07.2025
Transmission Date	

