

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2181 of 2016

- =====
1. Binod Mahto Son of Late Deoki Mahto, Resident of village- Kusmari, P.O. Kharsan, P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 2. Leela Devi, Wife of Punit Paswan, Resident of village- Somar, P.O. Pokhar Bhinda, P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 3. Fekan Das, son of Parmeshwar Das, Resident of village- Pipra, P.O. and P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 4. Guddu Paswan, son of Bhuil Paswan, Resident of village and P.O.- Kharsan, P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 5. Meena Devi, wife of Kapileshwar, Resident of village and P.O. Raghapur Bakhari, P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 6. Ram Pramod Rai, son of Sonelal Rai, Resident of village- Bhawanipur, P.O. Raghapur Bakhari, P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 7. Ram Ishwar Rai, son of Ramchandra Rai, Resident of village- Bhawanipur, P.O. Raghapur Bakhari, P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi
 8. Lal Babu Mestar, Son of Baidyanath Mestar, Resident of village- Majhaura, P.O. and P.S. Riga, District- Sitamarhi

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi, District- Sitamarhi
4. The District Programme Coordinator, Sitamarhi, District- Sitamarhi
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Sitamarhi, District- Sitamarhi
6. The Block Development Officer, Riga, District- Sitamarhi
7. The Block Programme Officer, Riga, District- Sitamarhi
8. The Pramukh, Block Panchayat Samiti, Riga, District- Sitamarhi

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Anita Kumari, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binod Ji Verma- Gp17

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 29-03-2016 Heard Mr. Ravi Ranjan, learned counsel for the
petitioner.

There is no representation on behalf of the State.



The limited grievance raised by the petitioner is against non-payment of their wages for the work executed by them in the different schemes by the State under the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (hereinafter referred to as the 'MANREGA') within the Block-Riga in the District of Sitamarhi during the financial year 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12.

Mr. Ranjan while referring to the Advisory of the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department dated 05.12.2013 submits that the District Magistrates concerned as well as the Deputy Development Commissioner who also happened to be the Programme Coordinator, have been advised to clear the dues of the labourers for the period in question but yet no steps have been taken by these authorities and hence the writ petition. Despite the orders passed on 11.2.2016 and 25.2.2016 requiring the District Magistrate, Sitamarhi to file their response but there is no counter affidavit on record.

In the circumstances and instead of delaying the present disposal, I deem it fit and proper to direct the District Magistrate, Sitamarhi to consider the grievance of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt / production of a copy of the

order. It goes without saying that the admissible claims of these petitioners should be paid within the said period and in case the claims are not found admissible in any period, the same should be disposed of by a speaking order to be passed within the same period.

The writ petition is disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--