

(2026) 08 PAT CK 2521

In the Patna High Court

Case No : Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11295 of 2026

Sujeet Kumar & Ors.

APPELLANT

Vs

The State Of Bihar & Ors.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-08-2026

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India — Article 14

Citation : 2026 INSC 99

Hon'ble Judges : Harish Kumar, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mr. Amit Pandey, Mr. Kumar Priyanandan, Ms. Ashmita Singh, Mr. Nandkishor Singh, Mr. Pawan Kumar, Mr. Raghav Vats

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Date : 03-08-2026 Heard Mr. Amit Pandey, learned Advocate for the petitioners and Mr. Pawan Kumar, learned Advocate for the State Housing Board. The State is represented through Mr. Nandkishor Singh, learned Advocate.

2. The grievance of the petitioners is that despite rendering more than 13-14 years of uninterrupted service against sanctioned post, upon validly appointed in terms with an Advertisement published long back in the year 2012, the respondents have neither framed any policy for their regularization nor taken any decision on their repeated representations seeking regularization and continuity of service.

3. It is submitted that the respondent Bihar State Housing Board had earlier regularized the services of other identically situated employees, pursuant to the decision taken in Board's 245th meeting, whereas in the case of the petitioners, the authorities have not taken any decision so far and, as such, *prima facie*, the action appears to be arbitrary and discriminatory.

4. It is further contended that since the very appointment of the petitioners took place in pursuant to Advertisement after following of the procedures in-

consonance with Article 14 of the Constitution of India and therefore, in no circumstances, there is any embargo in their appointment as laid down in the Constitution Bench decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs. Umadevi (3) : (2006) 4 SCC 1**, rather the petitioners' claim for consideration is fully guided by the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as rendered in the case of **Bhola Nath Vs. State of Jharkhand : (2026 INSC 99)**.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the Board fairly submitted that identical set of employees have approached this Court, who have been extended liberty to approach the authorities concerned by filing a detailed representation.

6. Having considered the limited grievance of the petitioners seeking consideration of their cases for regularization and for the said purpose, the petitioners have already filed a detailed representation, the copy of which is marked as Annexure- P/6, this Court deems it fit and proper to dispose off the writ petition with a direction to respondent no. 4 to consider the representation of the petitioners, as noted hereinabove, and bring to its logical conclusion in the light of the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as referred hereinabove, preferably within a period of ten weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

7. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed off.