

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1283 of 2017

Pintu Babu Ram Son of Sri Ram Yash Ram Resident of Village-Ramapur,
P.O.-Ratanpur, P.S.-Ara Muffasil, District-Bhojpur Ara.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Deputy Secretary Finance Department Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Secretary, Incharge Public Grievance Finance department Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Employment Officer Bhojpur at Ara.
5. Union Bank of India, X

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Maya Shankar Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Ranjit Kumar, AC to GP26
For the Bank	:	Mrs. Sheela Sharma, Adv.
		Mrs. Ranjeeta Sinha, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

8 20-03-2025 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and
Learned Counsel for the Union of India.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the present writ petition has been filed for directing the respondent Bank to appoint the petitioner on the post of part time Sweeper in Andhra Bank (now Union Bank) at Branch office, Ara in place of petitioner another candidate has illegally been appointed contrary to rule of selection process giving the petitioner all legal and consequential benefit attached to the said post.

3. Counsel further submits that the petitioner himself registered in Employment Exchange office, Bhojpur at Ara



having Registration No.SC-334/12 on 10.02.1990, he has renewed his name in the employment exchange from time to time.

4. Counsel further submits that a vacancy has come on the post of Part time Sweeper in which the petitioner has participated along with other candidates. He further submits that the petitioner has received information that the Bank Organisation has illegally not appointed the petitioner, instead thereof, appointed some other persons, and therefore, in this regard, he has made complaint to the Bank Officials. He further submits that by the counter-affidavit, it transpires to him that one Dipu Kumar has been appointed whose certificate is forge and fabricated.

5. Counsel for the Bank on the other hand submits that counter-affidavit has been filed and put emphasis on Annexure-R5-6, the investigation report dated 14.10.2016. He further submits that on the complaint of the petitioner, Investigation Officer has been appointed, who has submitted the investigating report and found that the complaint of the petitioner is not true therefore, he submits that the present writ petition filed by the petitioner is not maintainable at all.

6. After hearing the parties and going through the pleading, it transpires to this Court that on the complaint filed by the petitioner, the respondent Bank has initiated investigation



and had appointed Investigating Officer vide Letter No.2278/3/1053 dated 18.08.2016. The petitioner was directed to attain investigation, but he failed to appear before the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Officer after investigation had submitted his report after going through the documents and found that the allegation made by the petitioner in his complaint is not correct. He also found that there is no any violation made in the selection procedure of Recruitment of Part-time Sweepers at Ara Branch. As such, this Court is not inclined to pass any order and, hence, the present writ application is hereby dismissed.

7. Since the petitioner is now making allegation against the person, who has been appointed, namely Dipu Kumar that he has been appointed by virtue of forge and fabricated mark-sheet for which the petitioner shall be at liberty to raise those points before the appropriate authority and the appropriate authority shall take decision in this matter in accordance with law.

8. With the aforesaid directions and observations, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Prakashmani/-

U			
---	--	--	--

