

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8759 of 2025

Rajeev Kumar Son of Jagannath Singh, resident of Bindh Niwas, Singahi Colony, Bibiganj, Bhagwanpur, P.S. Muzaffarpur Sadar, District- Muzaffarpur presently working as Assistant (third grade employee) on daily wages/contractual basis in Langat Singh College, Muzaffarpur, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director Higher Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur through the Registrar.
5. The Vice Chancellor, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
6. The Registrar, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Finance Officer, Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Muzaffarpur.
8. The Principal, Langat Singh College, Muzaffarpur, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Vijay Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Standing Counsel 23
		Mr. Madhusudan Rai, AC to SC-23
For BRA Bihar University	:	Mr. Viveka Nand Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 27-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for respondent Baba Saheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University.

2. With the consent of both the parties, this writ application is being disposed of at this stage itself.

3. In the present writ application, the petitioner has



prayed for the grant of following reliefs:

“(I) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities to regularize the services of the petitioners as 3rd Grade employee (Assistant) in Langat Singh College, Muzaffarpur (hereinafter referred to as the College) on the ground that the petitioner was appointed after following the due process of selection as third grade employees (Assistant) against the sanctioned and vacant post in the year 2014 but on contractual/ daily wages basis and he is working as such since last several years continuously as also the services of similarly situated persons have already been regularized by the Respondent University ignoring the better claim of the petitioner.

(II) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS commanding and directing the Respondent University to grant consequential benefit of service counting the services of the petitioner from the date of his initial appointment.

(III) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS commanding and directing the Respondent University to allow the salary for "same work same pay" and pay monthly salary of Rs.26,069/- per month to the petitioner, who is working against 3rd Grade post on the basis of minimum basic pay of 7th pay-scale with admissible pursuant to the D.A. with effect from 10.03.2022 office order contained in memo no.B/1222 dated 18.07.2022 issued under the signature of the Respondent no.6.

(IV) For issuance of any other appropriate writ / writs, order orders direction / directions for which the writ petitioner would be entitled under the facts



and circumstances of the case.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the recent decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court delivered in the case of ***Vinod Kumar & Ors. Etc. Vs. Union of India & Ors.*** reported in **(2024) 1 S.C.R. 1230, Jaggo Vs. Union of India & Ors. [SLP (C) No. 5580 of 2024], Shripal & Anr. Vs. Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad (Civil Appeal Nos. 8158-8179 of 2024) and Dharam Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Anr. [Civil Appeal No(S). 8558 of 2018].**

5. He, therefore, submits that for claiming the aforesaid relief the petitioner be allowed to file a representation before the Vice-Chancellor of the respondent University relying upon the above enumerated Supreme Court judgments and further prays that if such a representation is filed, the Vice-Chancellor of the respondent University be directed to dispose of the same within a fixed time frame after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

6. To the aforesaid prayer being made by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the respondent University does not have any objection.

7. Considering the limited nature of prayer being made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this writ application



is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to file a representation before the Vice-Chancellor of the respondent University within one month from today, relying upon the above enumerated judgments of the Supreme Court and if such a representation is filed within the stipulated time the same shall be heard and disposed of within a further period of three months from the date of receipt of the representation by the petitioner.

8. Needless to emphasize that the final order which shall be passed by the respondent University should be a reasoned and speaking order and in case the petitioner is found entitled to the relief, which the petitioner would be claiming through the representation, the same should be extended to the petitioner within a period of one month from the date of passing of the final order by the Vice-chancellor of the respondent University.

9. With the aforesaid observation, direction and liberty granted, the present writ application stands disposed off. All pending interlocutory application(s), if any, shall also be deemed to have been disposed of.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Prakash Narayan

U			
---	--	--	--

