

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5884 of 2025

=====

Ramesh Yadav, Son of Laxmi Yadav, Resident of Village Agwanpur, Ward No.3, P.O Sisai District- Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate cum District IVth Grade Selection Committee, Saharsa.
3. The Deputy Collector (Nazarat), District Collectorate Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mithilesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (27)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved with the decision of the respondent no. 2 issued under memo no. 332 dated 20.02.2019 by which the claim of the petitioner stands rejected by taking into account that as per the approved roster the remaining four vacant post of the year 2017-18, under reserved category post (male), have already been filled up and there is no vacancy available.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner while assailing the impugned order has submitted that the reason assigned in the impugned order is completely based upon incorrect facts, inasmuch as, till date, still there is 851 available vacancies under



the different offices of the District Saharsa. Moreover, the respondent authorities have failed to consider the facts that the name of the petitioner finds placed in all the panel of the year 2007, 2012, 2014 and 2018; and thus his case has not been considered in the manner, which was required to be done under the law and he has been running from pillar to post.

4. Learned Advocate for the State submitted that earlier the petitioner had come before this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 9784 of 2018 and on permission being granted, the petitioner had preferred a detailed representation; after proper consideration the claim of the petitioner stands rejected by the impugned order. It is further submitted that so far the life of the panel is concerned, the same is meant only for a year and moreover, all the vacant seats have already been filled up, as it appears from the impugned order.

5. At this juncture, learned Advocate for the petitioner further submits that as per the instruction of his client; some of the junior persons have also been appointed against Class IV post, ignoring the claim of the petitioner.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the respective parties, and after going through the impugned order, this Court does not find any



illegality and impropriety in the order impugned; however if the petitioner would be able to show before the authority concerned that any of the junior persons from the panel has been appointed ignoring the claim of the petitioner, in such circumstances, the respondent authorities would be obliged to consider the claim of the petitioner and pass necessary order in accordance with law expeditiously.

7. The writ petition stands disposed off with the liberty aforesaid.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

