IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5505 of 2024

==========

Dinesh Kumar Paswan Son of late- Jago Pawsan, resident of Mohallah- Purnea Court Railway Colony, Purnea, P.S.- K. Hat, District- Purnea.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principle Secretory, Department of Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Vice-Chancellor, B.N. Mandal University, Laloo Nagar, Madhepura.
3. The Registrar, B.N. Mandal University, Laloo Nagar, Madhepura.
4. The Vice-Chancellor, Purnea University, Purnea.
5. The Principal, Purnea College, Purnea.
6. The Registrar, Purnea University, Purnea.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amit Kumar Anand, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh, AAG-13
		Mr. Abhinav Alok, Ac to AAG-13
For the Resp. No. 2 & 3	:	Ms. Aditi Sharma, Adv.
For the Resp. No. 4 to 6	:	Mr. Abhimanyu Vatsa, Adv.
		Mr. Sameer Sawarn, Adv.
		Mr. Rakesh Kumar Samrendra, Adv.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 11-11-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is in limited bound to the extent that despite having been rendering service for so many years and to be more specific with effect from 01.10.1999 on the post of Peon on daily wages, in terms with letter no. PR/292/1992 dated 01.10.1992 in Purnea College, Purnea, but his case has never been considered for regularization till date.

3. Referring to an order passed by a Division Bench of this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 9411 of 2022, it is submitted that identically situated persons have approached this Court, who

WEB COPY

had been working on vacant and sanctioned post since their date of initial appointment, nonetheless their cases were considered for regularization by the University, whereupon the Court has directed the petitioner to file a representation before the Registrar of the concerned University to consider the same and pass appropriate order in accordance with law. The petitioner also sought identical relief.

4. The claim of the petitioners though refuted by learned Advocate for the State and the University, however, they did not confront with the order passed by the learned Division Bench.

5. Having considered the limited grievance of the petitioner, this Court taking a lenient view deems it fit and proper to dispose off the writ petition with a liberty to the petitioner to approach before the respondent nos. 4 and 6 by filing a detailed representation. In case such a representation is passed alongwith the order of this Court passed in C.W.J.C. No. 9411 of 2022, the concerned respondent shall consider and dispose off the same, in accordance with law.

6. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			

WEB COPY