

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15503 of 2012

- =====
1. Poonam Devi W/O Pramod Paswan Resident Of Village- Thatia, Ward No. 11, P.O & P.S- Rosera, District- Samastipur.
 2. Sushila Devi W/O Mahesh Mahto Resident Of Village- Thatia, Ward No. 11, P.O & P.S- Rosera, District- Samastipur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Rural Works Department, Government Of India, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, Rural Works Department, Government Of India, New Delhi.
3. The State Of Bihar Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Principal Secretary, Rural Works Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Commissioner, Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga.
6. The D.M. Samastipur Cum Coordinator Manrega, Samastipur.
7. The Director, Manrega, National Employment Programme, Samastipur.
8. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Rosera, District- Samastipur.
9. The Block Programme Officer, Rosera, District- Samastipur.
10. The Block Development Officer, Rosera, District- Samastipur.
11. The Pramukh Prakhand Panchayat Samittee, Rosera, District- Samastipur.
12. Sudha Devi W/O Sunil Kumar Rai @ Lakhpati Rai @ Pachiya The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Chakthar West, Rosera Block, District- Samastipur.
13. Ahilya Devi W/O Subelal Das (Postman), Ward Member, Ward No. 11, Resident Of Village- Thatia, P.O & P.S- Rosera, District- Samastipur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Shankar Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Manikant Mishra Gp25

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 19-01-2016 Through this application, the petitioners who claim to have been employed under the Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme have alleged that in the matter of payment of wages, the respondents have committed

several illegalities. An enquiry in this regard was conducted by the Block Programme Officer as well as the Pramukh. The reports were contradictory. The writ application has been filed to make a proper enquiry into the matter and fix the responsibilities.

In the counter affidavit, the respondents have denied the allegations stating that some of the private respondents of this case have been paid their due wages. Counsel for the State, relied in this regard on diverse statements made in the counter affidavit.

In my view, a dispute of such nature cannot be gone into by the writ Court. Mr. Singh, counsel for the petitioner, having realized the same, after making submission at some length, states that they shall approach the respondent Sub Divisional Officer, Rosera, (respondent no.8) for ventilation of their grievance.

The writ application is disposed of permitting the petitioners to do so. If any such application is filed, the concerned respondent shall look into the same and take appropriate steps/action as deemed necessary expeditiously in accordance with law.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Shyam/-

U			
---	--	--	--