

(2008) 01 JH CK 0044
In the Jharkhand High Court

Hira Lal Mohanthy

APPELLANT

Vs

The Board of Governors and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 31-01-2008

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2008) 1 JCR 642

Hon'ble Judges : Amareshwar Sahay, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Amareshwar Sahay, J.—Heard the counsel for the parties.

2. In this writ application the petitioner has prayed for issuance of direction to the respondents to promote him to the post of Plumbing Mistry mainly on two grounds firstly, that he was working on daily wages from April 1981 to 1991 and on regular basis since 1991 till date and that the other person namely Rabindra Prasad, whose services were also regularized alongwith the petitioner, has been promoted to the post of Plumbing Mistry and, thereafter, he has been given three other promotions.

3. The petitioner and one Rabindra Prasad was appointed on daily wages as Plumbing Mistry since 1981 and their services were regularized in the year 1991 on the same post. However, the services of Rabindra Prasad were regularized as Plumbing Mistry against the vacant post. Thereafter, it appears from the pleadings of the parties that an internal advertisement was made for filling up of the posts of Mechanic-C and applications were invited, against which said Rabindra Prasad applied and after interview he was selected for the post of Mechanic-C, which is a Class-III post. The prayer of the petitioner is that he should also be promoted to the post of Plumbing Mistry.

4. In the counter affidavit, filed by the respondents, it has specifically been stated that though the petitioner has filed representation but the claim of the petitioner could not be considered because of the fact that he was not having

requisite qualification since he was non-matric. It is also stated in the counter affidavit that against the post of Mechanic-C, for which internal advertisement was made and said Rabindra Prasad applied and he was selected but the petitioner did not apply for the said post.

5. In view of the above facts, no case at all is made out for any interference by this Court. Accordingly, having found no merit, this application is dismissed.