

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6135 of 2011**

=====

Umesh Prasad son of Late Ram Narayan Singh resident of Mohalla -  
Indrapuri (Bajitpur), P.O. - Barh, (R.S.), District - Patna

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Secretary Panchayat Raj Officer, New Secretariat, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Patna
4. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Sone Bhawan, Bir Chand Patel  
Marg, Patna - 1
5. The Block Development Officer, Barh, District - Patna
6. Block Panchayati Raj Officer, Barh, District - Patna
7. Sarpanch Gram Kuchhari, Nawadah, Barh, District - Patna

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s :

For the Respondent/s :

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

12    26-02-2016                      Heard Sri Manoj Kumar Jha, learned counsel, who was  
  
assisted by Sri Rajesh Kumar Verma, learned counsel for the  
  
petitioner and learned AC to AAG No. 15.

The petitioner has approached this court invoking its  
writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India  
with a prayer to direct the respondents to pay his remuneration as  
'Nyay Mitra'.

It has been claimed that despite the fact that petitioner  
was rendering proper services, he is not being paid.

In this case a counter affidavit has been filed on behalf  
of the respondent no. 3, 4, 5 duly sworn by the Block

Development Officer , Barh, district- Patna and in paragraph no. 6 a stand has been taken that out of Rs. 1,77,983/-, Rs. 60,000/- has already been paid to the petitioner and assurance has been given regarding payment of balance amount after availability of the said fund.

In view of the statement made in paragraph no. 6 of the counter affidavit of respondent no. 3, 4 and 5 it was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner to dispose of the writ petition with a direction that step may be taken to clear the rest amount without any delay.

In view of submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner which appears to be reasonable, the court considers to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the respondents to take all steps so that the remaining due of the petitioner may be paid without any delay preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order.

**(Rakesh Kumar, J)**

Praful/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|