

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7741 of 2025

=====

Suman Kumar Singh son of Gajendra Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-Lal Kothi Naya Bazar, Ward No. -09, P.S.-Saharsa, District-Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through The Additional Chief Secretary Department of Law and Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Registrar General, High Court of Judicature at Patna.
3. The Registrar (Administration High Court of Judicature at Patna), Patna.
4. The Registrar Officer of the District and Sessions Judge District Court, Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ramadhar Singh (GP-25)
For the Resp. nos.2 to 4	:	Ms. Surya Nilambari, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 07-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Respondent nos.2 to 4.

2. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner directing the respondent authority to appoint his daughter on sanctioned vacant post of Class-III/Clerk under the judgeship of Saharsa on compassionate ground by making necessary correction in the appointment letter dated 04.09.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is true that the aggrieved person is the petitioner's daughter but,



the father has filed the present writ petition and the relief has been demanded for petitioner's daughter. He further submits that there was a letter issued by this Hon'ble Court bearing Letter No. 37377 dated 31.08.2021 (annexed as Annexure-P/6), which has completely been ignored and the petitioner's daughter was appointed on Class-IV post, whereas, she was entitled to be appointed on Class-III post.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the Respondent nos.2 to 4 raised objection with regard to the maintainability of the present writ petition and submits that it is not the petitioner whose right has been violated, rather, the person whose right has alleged to be violated has not come forward before this Court. The petitioner's daughter has already accepted her appointment on Class-IV post on compassionate ground with no objection and she is continuing on the said post. Counsel further submits that according to law, it is the aggrieved person who has to come forward for his/her grievance and not others. Therefore, counsel submits that this writ petition is not maintainable and fit to be dismissed on the threshold itself.

5. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that the present contest is between the petitioner and respondent nos.2 to 4 and State has limited role in this matter.



6. After hearing the argument, it transpires to this Court that the petitioner is not the aggrieved person, rather, the aggrieved person according to the petitioner is his daughter. But, the daughter has not come forward before this Court for the relief.

7. Therefore, this Court is of the firm view that no relief could be granted to the petitioner. So far as the merit of the case is concerned, it is admitted position that the petitioner's daughter has accepted her appointment on Class-IV post and she has not raised any grievance.

8. This Court is of the view that once, the petitioner's daughter has accepted her appointment on Class-IV post, then in that case, she has already exhausted her right under compassionate appointment. As such, this Court finds that there is no merit in this case. Hence, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

