



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11295 of 2026

1. Sujeet Kumar Son of Shri Chandeshwari Prasad Rai, Resident of House of Ekta Kumari. Gram Bhelwara, Sudha Dairy Pani Bottle Factory/Brajesh Singh Boring pas, Post-Mittanchak, PS - Gopalpur, Bhelaura, District Patna also at Qtr. No. J-142, Near J-Sector West Park, P.C. Colony, PS-Kankarbagh, P.O. Lohia Nagar, Patna-800020.
2. Nand Kumar Sharma, S/O Shri Sahdeo Thakur, Resident of Vill- Mahuli Nankar, P.O. Bandhauli, and PS. Jale District - Darbhanga PIN-847303.
3. Praveen Kumar Gupta, S/o Parmanand Gupta, Resident of - Khushkibagh (Hat). Near Durga Mandir, PS-Sadar Purnia East, District Purnia, PIN-854305.
4. Rajeev Kumar, Son of Shri Chhathu Sahani, Resident of Juran Chapra, Sahni Lane, Near Mai Asthan, P.O. M.I.T., PS-Bhramapura District - Muzaffarpur-842003.
5. Shailesh Kumar, Son of Shri Umesh Prasad Shahi, Resident of - Sandha, Jahangirpur, PS Baruraj District - Muzaffarpur.
6. Priyanka, W/O - Gyan Saurabh Shahi, Resident of Ward No 6, Chaupar Niwas, Damuchak Road, P.S.- Brahampur, Dist - Muzaffarpur-842003.
7. Rajiv Ranjan Kumar, Son of Shri Ram Bali Singh, Resident of D 3/3, Near Shiv Mandir, PS 0 Phulwarishariff. Dist Patna -801506.
8. Ravi Shankar, S/o Shri Bijay Kumar Sinha, Bakarganj, Abhandapokhar, PS Laheriasarai-District Darbhanga 846001.
9. Prashant Thakur, S/o Shri Gouri Nath Thakur, Rlo-Gupta Colony Atardah west of Mai Sthan PS Kazi Mohamadpur, Dist Musahri, Ramna.
10. Arbind Kumar, Son of Shri Raj Kumar Singh, Resident of LIG House 102. Bldg Usha Devi, Near Durga Mandir, Sector 02, Housing Colony PS-Barari, Dist- Bhagalpur 812003.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Urban Development and Housing, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Chairman, Bihar State Housing Board, 6, Sardar Patel Marg. Patna.
4. The Managing Director, Bihar State Housing Board, 6, Sardar Patel Marg, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar State Housing Board, 6, Sardar Patel Marg. Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Kumar Priyanandan, Adv.





For the Respondent/s : Ms. Ashmita Singh, Adv.
For the BSHB : Mr. Nandkishor Singh, Adv.
Mr. Pawan Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Raghav Vats, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
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.

(Harish Kumar, J)

sumit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	04.08.2026.
Transmission Date	NA

