

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.46 of 2025**

=====

Ranjit Kumar Sinha Son of Late Surendra Prasad Ambasta Resident of Mani Colony, Angara Chowk, P.S.- Madhubani District- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Engineer National Highway Wing Road Construction Department Bihar Patna Secretariat Bailey Road Patna
3. The Superintending Engineer National Highway Circle Road Construction Department Purnea Purnea.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                               |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Prabhu Nath Pathak, Adv.                  |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Ravi Kumar, AC to Government Pleader (13) |
|                      |   | Mr. Akshay Lal Prasad, AC to G.P. 13          |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL**

ORAL ORDER

2      10-01-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as  
  
counsel for the respondents.

2. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner is that even after the completion of the stipulated period in the service, the petitioner has not been granted benefit of second and third MACP for which he is entitled.

3. It is submitted by the counsel that initially the petitioner was appointed as a peon on 29.01.1980 subsequently, he was further appointed on the post of correspondence clerk on 31.12.1985 upon which he joined the services on 01.01.1986,



the benefit of ACP has been granted in favour of the petitioner on 14.02.2009 however, even after completion of the stipulated period in the service the petitioner has not been given benefit of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> MACP for which he has already made representation before the respondents/ competent authorities vide Annexure P-2 dated 30.08.2018 and even after this no decision has been taken. Learned counsel further prays that the respondent authorities may be directed to consider and take a decision on the representation of the petitioner in accordance with relevant rules and laws within any specific period fixed by this Court.

4. The above prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner is not opposed by the counsel for the respondents. He submit that if this Court directs then the representation of the petitioner will be decided by the competent authority within eight weeks.

5. Considering the submissions made by both the counsels the petition is disposed of directing the concerned authority i.e. respondent no. 3 to consider and decide the representation made by the petitioner vide Annexure P-2 in accordance with relevant rules and laws and take a decision within eight weeks from the date of receiving the order.



6. With the aforesaid observation, the petition is disposed of.

(Arvind Singh Chandel , J)

Siddharth Soni/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

