

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.1280 of 2023

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10563 of 2021

=====

Suraj Chandra Gupta Son of Sri Gautam Kumar Gupta, Resident of Ward No.12, South Hajipur, Near Bharat Press, P.O./P.S./District- Khagaria.

... .. Appellant

Versus

1. Life Insurance Corporation of India through the Zonal Manager, East Central Zonal Office, LIC of India, Patna.
2. The Zonal Manager, LIC of India, East Central Zonal Office, Patna.
3. Sr. Divisional Manager, Begusarai Divisional Office, Vishnu Cinema Campus, Deepshikha Road, Begusarai- 851101.
4. The Marketing Manager, Begusarai Divisional Office, Vishnu Cinema Campus, Deepshikha Road, Begusarai- 851101.
5. The Principal, Sales Training Centre (STC), LIC of India, Jiwan Jyoti Bhawan, Divisional Office Campus, Muzaffarpur- 842002.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant	:	Mr. Kumar Lalit, Advocate
For the Respondents	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Abhimanyu Vatsa, Advocate
		Mr. Sameer Sawarn, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 08-10-2025

The appellant has assailed the order of the learned Single Judge dated 18.09.2023 passed in CWJC No. 10563 of 2021.

2. The appellant was selected for the post of Probationary Development Officer. Before issuance of order of appointment he was sent among others for training for a period



of about one month. On completion of training at Muzaffarpur, he was given a regular posting to the post of Development Officer asking him to report on 01.02.2020 at Supaul. He could not report for duty on account of his father's certain illness and in this regard he had sought for alternative posting by means of application for posting nearby hometown. There was inaction on the part of the respondents. Thereafter, he had repeated request to reconsider his posting on 20.01.2020.

3. From perusal of the records it is crystal clear that the appellant's initial appointment at Supaul. He should have reported for duty and thereafter he should have requested for alternative posting on account of certain domestic issues. On the other hand, he failed to report even on 02.01.2020. Thereafter, also he has failed to report and keep on requesting for re-posting as is evident from his communication dated 20.01.2020. Perusal of the contents of the application for reconsideration of his re-posting, may not be feasible for the initial posting. In other words, he should have reported for duty at Supaul and thereafter, he should have requested. In the initial stage of service itself the petitioner cannot request for specific posting while disregarding to initial posting.

4. In the light of these facts and circumstances, the



learned Single Judge has not committed any error in rejecting the petitioner’s grievance.

5. Accordingly, the present LPA stands dismissed.

(P. B. Bajanthri, CJ)

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Shahnawaz/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	14.10.2025
Transmission Date	N/A

