

## State of Bihar Vs Anil Kumar Singh

**Court:** PATNA HIGH COURT

**Date of Decision:** May 9, 2016

**Citation:** (2016) 2 BBCJ 305 : (2016) 3 BLJud 187 : (2016) 4 PLJR 41

**Hon'ble Judges:** Mr. Navaniti Prasad Singh and Smt. Nilu Agrawal, JJ.

**Bench:** Division Bench

**Advocate:** Mr. Ajay Kumar Sharma, AC to PAAG, for the Appellants; M/s. B.B. Singh and S.K. Ranjan, Advocates, for the Respondents

**Final Decision:** Dismissed

### Judgement

Mr. Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.(Oral)â€"State is in intra-Court appeal against the judgment and order dated 11.05.2010 passed by learned Single

Judge of this Court in CWJC No. 2199 of 2009 whereby the learned Single Judge of this Court has been pleased to quash the termination order

issued under Memo No. 413 dated 30.12.2003.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the State and the learned counsel for the writ petitioner/respondent.

3. Having perused the judgment and order under appeal, we are of the view that the learned Single Judge has not committed any error that

requires interference. The learned Single Judge has clearly found that the termination order issued against the writ petitioner/respondent was

without any show cause notice and without any proper enquiry. It was not a case that the writ petitioner/respondent had worked for over 10 years

on basis of forged appointment letter. It is not in dispute that the writ petitioner/respondent had been working on daily wages in a Project School

and it was pursuant to directions issued by the District Magistrate that the District Education Officer adjusted him against permanent vacant post in

one of those Schools and appointment letter was issued in his favour.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the appointment was illegal and void ab initio and that being the position, the writ

petitioner/respondent had no right and he could not demand a hearing in the matter.

5. We are not in agreement with the submission. Whether the appointment was legal or illegal, that itself is a question that has to be decided. The

fact needs to be adjudicated. The fundamental principle of natural justice is that no action can be taken against a person, no order can be passed

against the adverse interest of the person without hearing him. That is the minimal requirement. A person cannot be condemned unheard. Whether

an appointment is void or illegal, as noted above, is an issue itself to be decided. The Apex Court, in the case of Basudeo Tiwary v. Sido Kanhu

University & Others since reported in (1998) 8 Supreme Court Cases 194, directly on the issue, answered the same. In that case, the

question was whether the appointment of a person in the University was valid or not. In that case, this Court had held that the appointment, as

made by the University, was illegal and, as such, termination was upheld. Their Lordships held that the High Court failed to consider the question

with regard to non-observance of rules of natural justice. The case arose in respect of Section 35 (3) of the Bihar State Universities Act, 1976 and

this is what their Lordships held in paragraph 13 :

13. Admittedly, in this case, notice has not been given to the appellant before holding that his appointment is irregular or unauthorized and ordering

termination of his service. Hence the impugned order terminating the services of the appellant cannot be sustained.

6. Similar is the view of the Division Bench of this Court in the case of Ram Krishna Dubey v. State of Bihar & Others since reported in

2008 (1) PLJR 841.

7. In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any error in the judgment of the learned Single Judge. This appeal is consequently dismissed.