

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.67 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13014 of 2012

=====

Md. Naseem son of Late Md. Hanif, Resident of Village- Sabutar
(Bhokaraha), Police Station- Krityanandnagar, District- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Commissioner, Purnea.
3. The Collector and District Magistrate, Purnea.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner cum Conducting Officer, Purnea.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer cum Conducting Officer, Banmankhi, Purnea.
6. The Deputy Establishment Officer cum Block Development Officer,
Dhamdaha, Purnea.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Ghosarvey, AC to AAG 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The present restoration application has been filed
for restoration of CWJC No. 13014 of 2012 to its original file,
which has been dismissed as not pressed on 22.01.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has filed CWJC No. 13014 of 2012 for quashing the
order dated 31.01.2012 issued by the Collector, Purnea whereby
the petitioner has been imposed punishment of dismissal from
service and further prayed to reinstate the petitioner on his post



of clerk (then Nazir) with all consequential benefits. He further submits that the petitioner engaged Mr. Hemant Kumar Karn as his counsel before this Hon'ble Court and handed over the brief to argue in the matter. He fairly submits that the petitioner has taken no objection from his counsel, namely, Hemant Kumar Karn and not appointed any new advocate to pursue the CWJC No. 13014 of 2012. He further submits that the counsel, namely, Hemant Kumar Karn had appeared on 22.01.2024 in CWJC No. 13014 of 2012 and informed this Court that the petitioner has taken no objection from the counsel and apart from that he has informed the Court that the petitioner has also taken away the file of the aforesaid writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the State on the other hand submits that from perusal of the order dated 22.01.2024 it appears that the learned counsel for the petitioner had submitted that the petitioner has taken no objection and the counsel for the petitioner has rightly informed this Court that he is not in a position to press the writ petition and accordingly, the writ Court has rightly dismissed the aforesaid writ petition as not pressed.

5. In view of the averments made in the restoration petition as well as the order dated 22.01.2024, no case is made out for restoration of the CWJC No. 13014 of 2012 because



learned counsel for the petitioner has informed this Court that he is not in a position to press the writ petition and the petitioner has taken no objection from the earlier counsel which suggests that on the 22.01.2024 the petitioner has not engaged any lawyer to pursue the case before this Court.

6. Accordingly, the restoration petition stands dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

