

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4230 of 2013

=====

Sanjivani Kumari, wife of Sri Shyam Sunder Thakur, resident of Village-
Sulsabad, Police Station- Mehsi, District- East Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Panchayati Raj, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari.
6. The District Panchayati Raj Officer, East Champaran.
7. The Block Development Officer, Mehsi Block, East Champaran.
8. Block Education Extension Officer, Mehsi Block, East Champaran.
9. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Harpur Nag, Mehsi Block, East Champaran.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajesh Kr.Verma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 24-08-2015

Learned counsel for the parties are present.

Although vide order passed on 10.5.2013 the writ petition was directed to be heard along with CWJC No.8583 of 2011 but it is stated at the Bar that the said writ petition has already been disposed of along with CWJC No.5350 of 2011 also filed by this petitioner and in which directions for payment of salary of the petitioner has been passed.

Let the copy of the order passed in CWJC No.8583 of 2011 heard and disposed of along with CWJC No.5350 of 2011 be maintained on the records of this proceeding.

Although the petitioner has prayed for an

appropriate direction to the respondent authorities to take appropriate action against the respondent no.9 who happens to be the Mukhiya of Gram Panchayat Raj, Harpur Nag, Block-Mehsi in the district of East Champaran under section 18(5) of the Bihar Panchayat Raj Act, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act') but all that I find in the writ petition is a representation which does not suffice the requirement warranting action thereon. This Court thus without entering into the intricacy of the issue raised and without expressing any opinion as to whether the complaint made by the petitioner would be sufficient to draw any proceedings under section 18(5) of 'the Act' disposes of this writ petition and the petitioner if so advised, may file a duly constituted application before the appropriate authority as prescribed under 'the Act' and which shall be considered and disposed of in accordance with law.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/-

U			
---	--	--	--