

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15397 of 2011

=====

Sulen Kumari W/O Sheo Kumar Ram R/O Village- Jalpura, P.S.- Haspura,
District- Aurangabad

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad
3. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Daudnagar, Aurangabad
4. The Block Development Officer, Haspura, Daudnagar, Aurangabad
5. Santoshi Kumari w/o Chitranjan Kumar R/O Village- Jalpura, P.S.-
Haspura, District- Aurangabad

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bachan Jee Ojha, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to SC-22

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 18-03-2016 Heard Sri Bachan Jee Ojha, learned counsel for the

petitioner, learned AC to SC-22 as well as Sri Deepak Kumar,

learned counsel for Respondent no.5.

In the present writ petition, filed under Article-226 of
the Constitution of India, the petitioner has made a prayer for
directing the Respondents to select the petitioner as Panchayat
Vikash Mitra. The case of the petitioner is that pursuant to an
advertisement, contained in Annexure-1 to the writ petition, the
petitioner applied for being appointed as Panchayat Vikash Mitra.
However, contrary to the advertisement, in an illegal manner,
selection of Respondent no.5 was made. Thereafter, she raised
objection and finally the present writ petition has been filed.

On perusal of Annexure-1 to the writ petition, it is evident that Vikash Mitra, as per advertisement, was to be appointed on contractual basis only for a period of eleven months. In the advertisement, specific dates were mentioned regarding raising objection and deciding the disputes. After resolving all objections, final decision was to be taken by the Sub Divisional Officer between 18.03.2010 to 20.03.2010 and thereafter, appointment letter was to be issued finally up to 24.03.2010. In paragraph-7 of the writ petition, the petitioner herself has made statement that on 03.08.2010, she had filed a petition regarding information and thereafter she came to know that incorrectly Respondent no.5 was appointed.

Keeping in view the fact that the engagement was itself contractual in nature only for a period of eleven months subject to revival as well as the fact that in advertisement itself, scheduled date was mentioned for raising objection, at belated stage no objection was required to be entertained and, as such, I do not find any ground to pass order in favour of the petitioner.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--