

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.200 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4101 of 2016

-
-
1. Pramod Kishore Narayan and Ors son of late Abinash Kishore Narayan resident of Road No. 8, Quarter No. 14, Bihar Veterinary College Campus, P.S. - Patna Airport, District - Patna.
 2. Vinay Kumar Son of late Ram Bhajan Singh resident of Village and P.O. - Chhoti Akona, P.S. - Ghosi, District - Jehanabad.
 3. Md. Waseem Son of late Abdul Shakur resident of Nasheman Colony, Khajurbanna, Patthar Ki Masjid, P.O. - Mahendru, P.S. - Sultanganj, District - Patna.
 4. Bir Chand Patel Son of Sri Isri Mahto resident of Mohalla - Purandarpur Near Devi Sthan, P.O. - G.P.O., P.S. - Jakkampur, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Agriculture Production Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
4. Chancellor, Universities of Bihar Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur/Biha
5. Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur through its Registrar.
6. Vice-Chancellor, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur.
7. Registrar, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur.
8. Director, Administration, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur.
9. Controller, Rajendra Agriculture University, Pusa, District - Samastipur.
10. Bihar Agriculture University, Sabour, District - Bhagalpur through its Registrar.
11. Vice-Chancellor, Bihar Agriculture University, Sabour, District - Bhagalpur.
12. Registrar, Bihar Agriculture University, Sabour, District - Bhagalpur.
13. Director, Administration, Bihar Agriculture University, Sabour, District - Bhagalpur.
14. Controller, Bihar Agriculture University, Sabour, District - Bhagalpur.
15. Principal, Bihar Veterinary College, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None



For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arya Achint, AC to AAG-13

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

8 31-07-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioners though
Mr. Arya Achint, learned AC to AAG-13 is present in the Court.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief(s):

*“to review the order dated 24.04.2017
passed in CWJC No. 4101 of 2016 by Hon’ble Mr.
Justice Ahsanuddin Amanullah (as his lordship
then was) by which his lordship has been pleased
to dismiss the aforesaid writ application.”*

3. A counter-affidavit on behalf of the respondent nos.
2 and 3 is on record and paragraph nos. 12, 13 and 16 read as
follows:

*12. That with regard to the claim of the
petitioners, the University (BAU) sent a report
under letter no. 180 dated 11.06.2016. From
perusal of the said report sent by the University it
is manifest that the petitioners are not entitled for
upgraded pay scale for the reason that the said
scale was never allowed to them by the University
nor was it withdrawn. Therefore, the petitioners*



can not claim for upgraded pay scale.

13. That in the counter-affidavit it was further stated that all those persons who were earlier allowed upgraded pay scale by the University and was subsequently withdrawn by the University, they only have been allowed the said pay scale and in this regard the necessary funds have already been made available to the University by the State Government.

16. That, eventually, the claim of these four petitioners has been rejected by the University vide office order no. 485 dated 05.05.2014 whereas the petitioners no. 1 to 28 of CWJC No. 2187 of 1997 were allowed the upgraded scale. It was challenged by the petitioners in CWJC No. 4101 of 2016 which was disposed vide order dated 24.04.2017 which is under review herein. Having heard the parties and considering all aspects of the matter, the Hon'ble Court dismissed the writ application."

4. This counter-affidavit was served upon the learned counsel for the petitioner on 17.11.2017 and there is no rebuttal



to it.

5. From the aforesaid counter-affidavit, it is clear that the petitioner has no case and as such, the review petition is fit to be dismissed.

6. However, since no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioners, the review petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

