

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17392 of 2024

=====

Ajit Singh S/o Sri Rambaboo Singh R/o-Rampur Kesho Urf Malahi R.K.
Malahi P.S.-Paroo District- Muzaffapur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar represented through the Additinal Chief Secretary, Education Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary Higher Education, Education Department Bihar Patna.
3. B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur represented through its Registrar.
4. The Vice-Chancellor, BRA Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Registrar, B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Manoj, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. AC to GP- 05
For the BRAU	:	Mr. Bindhyachal Rai, Adv. Mr. Sunil Kumar Karn, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 03-01-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AC to GP-5 and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the University.
2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the University at the outset submits that the writ application is misconceived, for the reason that petitioner was appointed as a Civil Engineer in the University on contractual basis for 11 months. It is further submitted that the appointment was purely on contractual, as such, no right accrued in the writ petitioner challenging his order of removal by filing a writ application seeking a writ of certiorari. It is next submitted that from perusal



of the order impugned dated 24.06.2024 (Annexure-P1), issued by the Registrar of the University, it would manifest that the same records that the Vice Chancellor after due consideration has been pleased to terminate the contractual service of the petitioner, as Assistant Engineer notified vide University Memo No.B/2497 dated 10.11.2023 with immediate effect. It is further submitted that the order removing the petitioner is not stigmatic as such it cannot be said that a show-cause was required before terminating the contractual service of the petitioner. It is further submitted that in the event, if the petitioner is aggrieved by his removal, in that event, he has remedy of approaching a Court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the lis adjudicated.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the university that the appointment was purely contractual and the order of removal is not stigmatic.

4. The writ application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

