

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20625 of 2013

=====

Shyam Sundar Yadav @ Shyam Sundar Prasad Yadav Son Of Sri Guli Chandra Yadav @ Gulichandra Pd. Yadav Resident Of Village- Bharkahua, P.O. P.S.- Barhat, District- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary-Cum-Commissioner, Administrative Personnel Department, Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Jamui
4. The Block Education Officer-Cum-Comptroller Kasturba Gandhi, Residential School, Brahat Jamui, P.O. P.S. Barahat, District- Jamui

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Prakash Mahto
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Raghwendra Kumar, SC -22
		Mr. Rajesh Roy

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY

ORAL ORDER

5 09-01-2026 1. Heard the Learned counsel for the parties.

2. This Writ petition has been filed by the petitioner for a direction to the respondents especially the District Magistrate, Jamui/ respondent no. 3 to appoint the petitioner for the post of Group-D considering his experience certificate of 1806 days under the district Jamui pursuant to the advertisement published on 26/27.10.2012, in the light of order dated



16.10.2012 passed in MJC No. 2950/2012 and MJC No. 3060/2012 and for grant of other reliefs to which the petitioner is entitled.

3. The main contention of the Writ petitioner is that he had 1806 days experience and, therefore, he has filed the present Writ petition for direction to the respondents for his appointment on the Group -D post.

4. Pursuant to the filing of the Writ petition, the selection process has been completed and some other persons were also selected for the said Group -D post. It appears that the petitioner has not challenged the selection process. Furthermore, from perusal of the orders passed in MJC No. 2950/2012 and MJC No. 3060/2012, it is evident that based on the supplementary affidavit filed by the District Magistrate, Jamui, both the contempt petitions were disposed off. There were no such direction in the said contempt petition as prayed by the petitioner in the present Writ petition.

5. Taking into consideration that the selection process has already been completed,



there cannot be any direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for his appointment on the Group-D post at such a belated stage, especially when he has not challenged the selection process.

6. However, if at all, the petitioner is aggrieved by the action of the respondents, he is at liberty to challenge the aforesaid selection process.

7. The Writ petition, therefore, is dismissed as having become infructuous.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

sunilkumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

