

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6183 of 2025

=====

Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjit Kumar, Son of Sukhdeo Das, Resident of Village-
Lattipur, P.S. - Biipur, District - Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

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

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dharendra Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Prabhakar Jha, GP-27
For Bhoodan Yagya Committee	:	Mr. Rajnikant Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 24-04-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking a direction upon the respondent to appoint him against the post of Amin in the office of District Bhoodan Yagya Committee, Bhagalpur taking into account his services rendered as an Amin in the said office with effect from 06.01.2004 to 07.07.2007.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that it is the admitted position as is evident from Annexure P/1 that the petitioner has discharged the work of Amin in the office of the Bhoodan Yagya Committee, Bhagalpur for more than three years as noted hereinabove, but, the case of the petitioner has never been considered for absorption/regularization, compelling



him to approach this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 12139 of 2015.

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.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

