

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.507 of 2025

1. Rajeev Ranjan Son of Shiv Shankar Ram, Resident of Vill- Mashrakh Gopalbari, P.S.- Dist.- Saran.
2. Vimlesh Kumar Son of Madheshwar Mistry, Resident of Vill- Deoghara, P.S.- Kako, Dist.- Jehanabad.
3. Priytam Bihari Son of Baleshwar Prasad, Resident of Vill- Khandpar, Sheikhpur, P.S. Sheikhpura, Dist.- Sheikhpura.
4. Shashi Kumar Jayswal Son of Jay Prakash Prasad Resident of Ward No.-23, Purab Muhalla, P.S- Bhabhua, Dist.- Bhabua.
5. Rajesh Kumar Thakur Son of Hari Thakur, Resident of Ward No.-5, Naya Tola Falkaha, P.S Fulkaha, Dist.- Araria.
6. Deepak Kumar Son of Dindayal Prasad Yadav, Resident of Vill- Hardiya, Rajauli, Dist.- Nawada.
7. Karan Son of Upendra Prasad, Resident of Vill- Barki Dhava, P.S.- Ekanagar Sarai, Dist.- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Home (Prison), Government of Bihar.
2. The Secretary, Department of Home, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Labour Resources, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Inspector General (Prison), Govt. of Bihar.
5. The Joint Secretary cum Director (Administration), Department of Home (Prison), Govt. of Bihar.
6. The Secretary, Information Technology Department, Govt. of Bihar.
7. The Managing Director, Bihar State Electronics Development Corporation Ltd., Beltron Bhawan, Patna.
8. The Administrator, Urmila Info Solution, Banke Bihari Sadan, S.K. Puri, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Shilpi Keshri, Advocate Mr. Saurabh Keshri, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Mohit Agarwal, AC to AG

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

6 13-07-2026

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioners have filed the instant application for



the following reliefs:

“i. Direction to the respondent authorities to consider the case of the petitioners for the purposes of regularization of their services on the ground that they have been working on the sanctioned post of V.C. Operator from the past several years.

ii. Direction to the respondent authorities to enhance the salary of the petitioner as per salary prescribed for the sanctioned post of V.C. Operators, since the petitioners are getting the same salary from past several years without any enhancement which is against the principal of natural justice and is an utter exploitation of the petitioners.

iii. Direction to the respondent authorities to disposed of the representation dated 22.04.2022 filed on behalf of petitioners.

iv. Direction to the respondent authorities to increase the salary of petitioners to the tune of 10% in the light of memo no. 576 dated 27.04.2017 issued by the secretary of Govt. and pay due from



the date of their entitlement.

*v. For any other writ/writs
for which petitioner deemed entitled
to.”*

3. The case of the petitioners in brief is that the Home Department, Government of Bihar having outsourced some of the facilities with respect to managing the video conferencing and CCTV in the District Courts and Jails from BELTRON, the petitioners who were selected were working as video conferencing operators (VC operators) in different District Courts and Jails.

4. The prayer of the petitioners in the instant writ application are two fold - firstly for regularization of the services on the ground that they have been working on the sanctioned post of the video conferencing operator for the past several years and secondly for a direction to the respondents to enhance the salary of the petitioners as per salary prescribed for the sanctioned post of video conferencing operators.

5. At the outset, it is submitted by learned counsel appearing for the respondents in reference to the statements made in paragraph nos.6 to 9 of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondent nos.1, 2, 4 and 5 that on the BELTRON having submitted a proposal to the department for the



establishment of video conferencing system along with manpower for handling these systems, the Home Department (Jail) signed an MOU regarding the establishment of video conferencing systems in jails as well as in Courts and also for supply of manpower for operating the systems. The services of the operators are taken from BELTRON, a unit of the IT Department which supplies manpower from an outsourcing agency namely Urmila Info Solution, Patna.

6. It is the categorical case of the respondents that so far as the petitioners are concerned, they are neither the regular nor contractual employees of the Home Department (Jail) as the operators have been hired from BELTRON for functioning of the video conferencing systems. There is no sanctioned post of video conferencing operator in the Home Department (Jail).

7. Even if the case of the petitioners is accepted that they have been working as a video conferencing operator, in view of the categorical assertion of the respondents that there is no sanctioned post of the video conferencing operator, the question of regularization of the petitioners on a non-existing post does not arise.

8. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that even if the prayer for regularization of the



petitioners does not find favour with the Court, the Court may consider directing the respondent authorities to enhance the salary of the petitioners.

9. As per the counter affidavit of the State of Bihar, referred to herein above, the BELTRON being a unit of the IT Department and it is the BELTRON who has engaged the services of the agency Urmila Info Solution, Patna through whom the petitioners have been engaged for carrying out the work, in view of the facts of the case, let the petitioners file individual and separate representations before the Managing Director of the Bihar State Electronics Development Corporation Limited, BELTRON Bhawan, Patna (respondent no.7) within a period of four weeks which shall be decided by the respondent concerned within a period of three months from the date of its filing.

10. It is made clear that the Court has not entered into the merits of the case of the petitioners, which is to be decided by the respondent concerned.

11. The application stands disposed off.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saauravkrsinha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

