

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2560 of 2015

=====

1. Subhadra Devi Wife of Mangal Prasad Sharma R/o Village - Dharahan Tola
Rahika, P.S- Pranpur, District - Katihar.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Deptt. Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Chief Development Services, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Purnea Division Purnea.
4. The Regional Development Officer, Purnea Division, Purnea.
5. The District Magistrate, Katihar.
6. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Katihar.
7. The District Programme Officer, Katihar.
8. The Chief Development Project Officer, Pranpur, Katihar.
9. The Block Development Officer, Pranpur, Katihar.
10. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Dharahan, Pranpur, Katihar.
11. Ranju Kuamri Wife of Prabhakar Mandal R/o Village - Rahika, P.O - Dharhan, P.S- Pranpur, District - Katihar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr. SC19-Ajay Behari Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 11-02-2015

There is adequate material and evidence emerging from the findings given in the impugned order dated 6.12.2014 passed by the District Programme Officer, Katihar that the so-called resignation letter tendered by the petitioner from the post of Ward Member on 19.1.2007 was a farce and there is no evidence that such a resignation was tendered and accepted. Obviously, a plea has been taken now to overcome the rigors of her selection, which has been done contrary to the guidelines that such a person cannot be selected as a Aangan

Bari Sevika.

The District Programme Officer has clearly recorded from the evidence produced before him that the petitioner has continued to sign registers and proceedings of meetings even after so-called resignation as a Ward Member. If she has genuinely tendered her resignation then there was no occasion for her to put her signature on any other proceedings as a Ward Member. Therefore, the finding that she did not cease to be a Ward Member on the date selection was made is not required to be interfered with.

Writ application is dismissed as there is no merit.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

sk

U			
---	--	--	--