

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6810 of 2024

1. Sanjiv Paswan, Son of Manni Paswan, Resident of Village- Navtolia, P.S.- Rajoun, District - Banka.
2. Kaju Kumar Yadav, Son of Late Uday Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village - Morama, P.S.- Rajoun, District - Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Home (Special) Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General Cum Commandant General of Home Guard, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate-Cum-Collector, Banka.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Banka.
6. The Additional Collector, Banka.
7. The District Welfare Officer, Banka.
8. The District Commandant, Bihar Home Guards, Banka.
9. The Incharge Officer, District General Section, Banka.
10. The Incharge Deputy Development Commissioner cum Director Accounts Administration, and self Employment, District Rural Development agency Banka.
11. The S.D.O., Banka.
12. The District Information and Technology Officer, Banka.
13. The Deputy Superintendent of Police (H.Q.), Banka.
14. The District Information Manager, Banka.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bipin Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (24)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2025 Heard the parties.

2. In pursuant to the liberty accorded to the petitioner in C.W.J.C. No. 5341 of 2022, the petitioner has preferred a detailed representation before the respondent nos. 4 and 8,



however, it has been informed to this Court that the same was rejected by the respondent no. 4 on 19.01.2024 on being found that the petitioner has failed to produce any evidence in support of his contention to show that re-medical test was held after publication of merit list. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent nos. 1 to 4 and it is averred that since the claim of the petitioner was rejected by the Medical Board constituted for this purpose, as such, the claim of the petitioner was turned down on 19.01.2024, the copy of such order has been placed on record as Annexure R/D.

3. Confronted with the aforesaid situation, learned Advocate for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with a liberty to assail the same.

4. Learned Advocate for the State has no objection.

5. In view thereof, the present writ petition stands disposed off with the liberty aforesaid.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

