

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.605 of 2025
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6183 of 2025

=====
Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjit Kumar son of Sukhdeo Das, Resident of Village-
Lattipur, P.S.-Bihpur, District-Bhagalpur.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
3. The Additional Collector, Bhagalpur.
4. The Bihar Bhoodan Aogya Committee Gardanibagh Road No. 34, Patna through its Chairman.

... .. Respondent/s

=====
Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Dharendra Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Additional Advocate General (12)

=====
CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 12-01-2026

This Letters Patent Appeal has been filed challenging the order dated 24.04.2025 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 6183 of 2025. The writ petition was filed by the appellant with the following prayers:

(i) For issue an appropriate writ in the nature of writ/ writs, order/ orders, direction/ directions commanding the respondents to make appointment of the petitioner on the post of A min in the office of District Bhoodan Yagya Committee



Bhagalpur as petitioner has already worked as a Amin in the said office from 06.01.2024 to 07.07.2007.

(ii) To direct the respondent appoint the petitioner on the post of Amin by virtul of letter no. 2342 dated 22/10/2009 issued by the Respondent no.3 (Annexure-5) series by which the name of the petitioner was recommended for appointment but the same was not complied with.

(iii) To grant any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is found entailed.

2. The learned Single Judge, after hearing learned counsel for the appellant as well as the respondent, came to hold as follows:-

"4. Notwithstanding the liberty accorded to the petitioner by this Court to avail the alternative remedy when the petitioner approached before the concerned authorities of the Bhoodan Yagya Committee, his claim was not considered in the right perspective and it stood rejected, hence, the petitioner preferred the present writ petition.

5. Learned Advocate for the Bhoodan Yagya Committee has taken this Court through the order passed in the earlier round of litigation and submitted that the Court on being found no merit in the writ petition, has given liberty to the petitioner to avail alternative remedies and, in fact, the writ



petition stands dismissed as not pressed; hence, in any circumstances the present writ petition is not maintainable. Moreover, the petitioner has worked only for few years, that too in the year 2004 to 2007 and now the present writ petition came to be filed after such a belated stage.

6. Considering the submissions advanced on behalf of learned Advocate for the parties, this Court does not find any merit in the present writ petition, accordingly the writ petition stands dismissed.

7. It is suffice to observe that the petitioner had already been accorded liberty in the earlier round of litigation, hence no further order is required."

3. From the averments made in the writ petition, it appears that the petitioner worked for a few years between 2004 and 2007. Thereafter, he approached this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 12139 of 2015, which was disposed of on 25.08.2023. The learned counsel for the appellant withdrew the said writ petition to avail of the alternative remedy. It is submitted that, for availing such remedy, petitions were filed before the District Magistrate, Bhagalpur on 07.09.2023 and also on 28.11.2023. It further appears that the learned District Magistrate rejected the petitions filed by the appellant.



4. The main contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that, since the petitioner had served for three years as an Amin, he should be granted relief and appointed to the post of Amin in the office of the District Bhoodan Yagya Committee, Bhagalpur. We are not inclined to accept such a prayer. The appellant has not made out a case to get the relief as sought for.

5. Moreover, we find no perversity or illegality in the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge. Merely because the appellant worked for a few years on a contractual basis, that by itself cannot be a ground to give him appointment on a regular basis.

6. Accordingly, the Letters Patent Appeal, being devoid of merits, stands dismissed.

(Sangam Kumar Sahoo, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Neha/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	15.01.2026
Transmission Date	

