

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8318 of 2017

-
1. Shanti Devi wife of Virendra Pandit resident of village Tareganadih, P.S. Masaurhi, District Patna.
 2. Laxmi Devi wife of Satyendra Mochi resident of village Hathia, Kansarai, P.S. Maner, District Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary Home (Jail) Department, Government of Bihar, Main Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Main Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Inspector General (Prison) Home (Jail) Department, Main Secretariat, Patna.
4. The Superintendent, Sub Jail Masaurhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Sujeet Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Manish Kumar- Gp4

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

3 16-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioners have filed the instant application for
the following relief(s):

*“That this application is being filed for
issuance of writs/order/ orders and/or direction/
directions for commanding the respondents concerned
for regularizing service of the petitioner on the post of
SAFAI KARAMCHARI in the Jail Department and
further for making payment of salary as prescribed for
Class VI employee and also further to grant all
consequential benefit to the petitioner for which they*



are entitled for.”

3. At the outset, it is submitted by learned counsel for the respondents that the case of the petitioners was considered by the respondents and by order dated 24.11.2016 (Annexure-A to the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondent nos.1, 3 and 4), the Departmental Committee rejected the candidature of the petitioners. It is further submitted that the said order of rejection has not been challenged by the petitioners in the instant writ application.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners referring to the statements made in the rejoinder to the counter affidavit and more particularly paragraph nos.4 and 5 thereof, submits that the respondents have erred in rejecting the candidature of the petitioners. He will be filing a fresh representation raising the issues in paragraph nos.4 and 5 of the rejoinder before the competent authority praying for reconsideration of the rejection of the petitioner's candidature. It is further submitted that the petitioners are still working.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances stated herein above, the writ application is disposed of.

6. In case the petitioners so file a representation/petition praying for reconsideration of the rejection of the candidature within a period of four weeks, the



same shall be considered and decided in accordance with law within a period two months from the date of its filing.

7. The writ application stands disposed of with the above observations and directions.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

