

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 14883 of 2007

=====

Ranjana Choubey, W/o Pramod Kumar Tiwari, resident of village
Jurawanpur Gopalpur, P.S. Bidupur, District Vaishali.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Vaishali at Hajipur.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Vaishali at Hajipur.
4. The Block Development Officer, Bidupur Block, Vaishali at Hajipur.
5. The Supervisor, Gram Panchayat Raj Jurawanpur Block Bidupur,
District Vaishali.
6. The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Raj Jurawanpur Block Bidupur,
District Vaishali.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Kishore Thakur

For the Opp. Party/s : AC to Addl. Advocate General - 11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3. 18-02-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.C. to Addl. Advocate General – 11.

The petitioner, invoking writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, has prayed for directing the respondents to accept her joining on the post of Gram Kachahari Sachiv, for which, advertisement was made some time in the year 2007.

It was pleaded that pursuant to the advertisement, the petitioner participated in the selection process and a panel was prepared, in which, she was placed at serial no. 1, however; she was denied joining on the ground that as per the appointment letter, she had not turned up within time and as such, the second

person in the panel, namely; Harischandra Kumar was given employment and he joined on 17-10-2007.

In this case, a counter affidavit has been filed, wherein it has been indicated that appointment of Gram Kachahari Sachiv was for the tenure of work period of Sarpanch and the work period of the Sarpanch has already ended on 26-06-2011.

Learned State counsel points out that in the writ petition, the person, who was appointed in place of the petitioner, has also not been impleaded as party.

Be that as it may since the tenure of Sarpanch has already expired, in view of statement made in paragraph 8 of the counter affidavit, no positive order can be passed in favour of petitioner.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay/-

U			
---	--	--	--