

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6465 of 2008

=====

Nunu Devi @ Kumari , wife of Late indradeo Giri, resident of Mohalla
Naya bazaar, Ward No. 3, Saharsa, Post office and police Station –
Saharsa, Block - Kahra, district Saharsa

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms,
government of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Saharsa
4. The Additional District magistrate Saharsa
5. The Commissioner, Kosi Division Saharsa
6. the Deputy Development Commissioner, Saharsa
7. The Deputy Collector Establishment, Saharsa Collectorate Saharsa
8. The Deputy Collector nazarat Saharsa Collectorate Saharsa
9. The Superintending Engineer, Canal Circle Saharsa
10. The joint Agriculture Director, Saharsa
11. the Regional Deputy Director Education Kosi Division, Saharsa
12. the Civil Surgeon cum Chief Medical officer, Saharsa
13. The District leprosy Eradication Officer, Saharsa
14. The Executive Engineer Minor irrigation Saharsa
15. The district Annual Animal Husbandry Officer, Saharsa
16. the District Education Officer Saharsa
17. the District Superintendent of Education Saharsa
18. The Agriculture Officer Saharsa
19. The Executive Engineer Road Division, P.W.D. Road Saharsa
20. the District Welfare officer Saharsa

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy
Mr. Ashish Dev

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 23-03-2015 Heard Sri Jitendra Kumar Roy, learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned AC to SC No. 31.

The petitioner invoking writ jurisdiction of this court
under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has prayed for
directing the respondents to consider her name for appointment
on Class IV post within the district of Saharsa. It has been

claimed that petitioner had also applied against the advertisement issued on 7.9.2006.

Learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that petitioner had worked as daily wager since 2003 and pursuant to advertisement she had applied, however, no panel was finally published. On aforesaid grounds it has been prayed for directing for considering appointment of the petitioner.

In this case a counter affidavit has been filed, however, it was not served on learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned State Counsel submits that he is not having copy of brief. Accordingly, the court proposes not to take note of the counter affidavit.

Keeping in view the prayer made in the writ petition, the court is of the opinion that no relief can be granted. It is admitted position that petitioner worked as daily wager from 2003 only. Of -course for the time being if it is accepted that as per advertisement she applied and no panel has been prepared, the court is of the opinion that only by way of applying, one does not have indefeasible right for being appointed.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

Praful/-

U			
---	--	--	--