

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 1343 of 2017

Arising out of

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 5456 of 2017

=====

Sanjay Kumar, Son of Sachidanand Singh, resident of Sultanpur, P.S.- Danapur Cant, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through, the Chief Secretary Sri Anjani Kumar Singh, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Durgesh Nandan, the Secretary, State Election Commission, Bihar.
3. Sanjay Kumar Agarwal, the District Magistrate-cum-District Election Officer (Nagarpalika), Patna.
4. Sushil Kumar, Block Development Officer cum Revising Authority, Danapur, Patna.
5. Sanjeev Kumar, the Sub-Divisional Officer, Danapur, Patna.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sandeep Shahi, Advocate
For the SEC	:	Mr. Amit Shrivastava and Mr. Sanjeev Nikesh, Advocates
For the State	:	Mr. Kaushal Kumar Jha, A.A.G. 8 Mr. K. C. Jha, A.C. to A.A.G. 8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-08-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, State and State Election Commission.

2. After some arguments, on the basis of materials on record, the Court does not find that there is any willful and deliberate violation of the order of the Court dated 17.05.2017/20.04.2017 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 5456 of 2017.

3. Accordingly, the application stands disposed off.

4. However, in view of the elections having been held



to the body, it shall be open to the parties, who may be aggrieved, to move before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law, for any relief. Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out to the Court that the present S.D.O., who was the person mainly responsible for this controversy, has been at the place for the last two years, prior to which he was posted as the Deputy Collector Land Reforms at that very station for two and a half years and thus, he is at the same place for four and a half years now, which is not conducive to good and fair governance since, but naturally, he would have developed vested interest.

5. Be that as it may, in view of stand taken by learned counsel for the State that the authorities would take note of the same, the Court does not propose to go into such issue.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

