

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6441 of 2025

=====

Amit Kumar Singh S/o Chandrika Singh, R/o Mohalla Faizula, P.O. Lal Bagh,
P.S.- Laheriasarai, Dist. - Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Joint Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Engineer-in-Chief-Cum Special Secretary, Public Health Engineering Department, Bihar, Patna.
5. The Regional Chief Engineer, Public Health Engineering Department, Bihar, Muzaffarpur Zone.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Darbhanga Circle, Darbhanga.
7. The Superintending Engineer, Muzaffarpur Circle, Muzaffarpur.
8. The Executive Engineer, Public Health Division, Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Siyaram Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Mahendra Prasad Verma, AC to SC-20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 21-04-2026 Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and

learned counsel appearing for the State are present.

2. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition for

the following relief/s :-

“Writ of Certiorari for setting
aside/quashing the office order no. 17 dated-
27.02.2025 as contained in memo. 671 dated-
27.02.2025 with memo no. 672 dated-
27.02.2025 (Correction Letter) issued by the
office of the Executive Engineer, Public Health
Division, Darbhanga and be pleased to quash
the letter no. 150 dated-25.02.2025 issued by



the Joint Secretary, Public Health Engineering Dept., Govt. of Bihar, Patna by which the Executive Engineer, Public Health Division, Darbhanga was directed to suspend the petitioner with immediate effect and constitute the departmental proceeding against him as per law.

ii. And/or be pleased to pass such other order or orders which maybe deemed fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the State has raised a preliminary objection and submits that an appeal is maintainable against the order of suspension.

4. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits, on instructions, that the suspension order has already been revoked, though he is not in a position to bring the said order on record.

5. In view of the submission made on behalf of the petitioner that the suspension order has been revoked, the present case has rendered infructuous.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

