

ITEM NO.24

COURT NO.13

SECTION XVI

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 10460/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 03-10-2024 in LPA No. 147/2022 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Patna]

VISHAL RANJAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF BIHAR & ORS.

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION and I.R.

IA No. 57561/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

IA No. 57563/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 04-04-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Manan Kumar Mishra, Sr. Adv.
M/S. Ram Sankar & Co, AOR
Mr. Manan Kumar Mishra, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Anjul Dwivedi, Adv.
Dr. Ram Sankar, Adv.
Mrs. Harini Ramsankar, Adv.
Mrs. Usha Prabakaran, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.

2. This petition arises from the order passed by the High Court of judicature at Patna dated 3.10.2024 in Letters Patent Appeal No.

147 of 2022 by which the division Bench of the High Court, dismissed the appeal filed by the petitioner hearing in and thereby affirming the judgement and order passed by the learned single judge rejecting the original petition filed by petitioner herein.

3. The impugned order is short, the same reads thus:-

"The appellant is before us aggrieved by the judgment of the learned Single Judge; which refused to interfere with the severance of service on the ground that it was a contractual appointment that too for a specific period.

2. The learned Counsel for the appellant asserts that he was appointed for an eleven month tenure and though he submitted his joining on 05.08.2019, he stood terminated on 22.05.2020, without any show-cause notice and that too within the period of his tenure.

3. Despite the Counsel asserting that the tenure was for eleven months, there is nothing produced, on record, to show that the tenure was eleven months. It is admitted that it was a contractual appointment.

4. In such circumstances, we find that even if it was for eleven months, the petitioner filed the writ petition in the year 2021, after the expiry of his tenure. As of now, there is no ground for restoration, especially in a contractual employment which was also for a specified tenure, which has long expired, as of now.

5. We find absolutely no reason to interfere with the impugned judgment and hence, the appeal stands dismissed."

4. The plain reading of the impugned order would indicate that the appointment of the petitioner herein was contractual.

5. His services ultimately came to be terminated.

6. Having regard to the nature of the appointment there is practically nothing that the High Court could have done. In our view, the High Court rightly declined to grant any relief.

7. At this stage, Mr. Manan Mishra the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the original impugned order of termination is stigmatic. This will come in the way of the

petitioner if he wants to secure any other employment in future.

8. The High Court has not said a word about any stigma being attached to the original termination order.

9. The petitioner stood terminated way back on 22.5.2020 only on the ground that his appointment was not permanent and the same was contractual. There is no stigma attached to his termination.

10. With the aforesaid this petition stands dismissed.

11. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(CHANDRESH)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)