

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12905 of 2010

=====

Baldeo Ram S/O Shri Musay Ram R/O Vill.- Sakhua, Gram Panchayat-
Babhangama, P.S.- Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa
3. The District Magistrate-Cum-District Officer -Cum- District Collector Supaul
4. The District Welfare Officer, Supaul, Distt.- Supaul
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division-Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
6. The Sub-Divisional Welfare Officer Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
7. The Block Development Officer , Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
8. Anuradha Bidyakar D/O Shri Suresh Ram R/O Vill.- Babhangama, P.S.- Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
9. Suresh Ram S/O Kamleshwari Ram R/O Vill.- Babhangama, P.S.- Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amrit Abhijat
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to GA-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 12-04-2017 Heard Sri Amrit Abhijat, learned counsel for the

petitioner and learned AC to Govt. Advocate no.10.

The petitioner has approached this Court, invoking
its writ jurisdiction under Article-226 of the Constitution of India,
with a prayer to direct Respondent no.3/ District Magistrate-cum-
District Collector, Supaul to conduct enquiry on representation of
the petitioner dated 29.03.2010 (Annexure-5 to the writ petition).
A plea has been taken that Respondent no.8 was selected as
Vikash Mitra, whereas in the selection process, her father also had



also participated.

Learned counsel for the petitioner tried to persuade the Court that difference of age in between Respondent no.8 and her father was only about 11 years, which apparently suggests that fraud was committed. However, he was not in a position to satisfy the Court as to whether the age of Respondent no.8 was mentioned fraudulently or not.

Learned State Counsel, by way of referring to Annexure-1 of the writ petition i.e. guidelines for selection of Vikash Mitra, submits that it was selection only for 11 months and, as such, after expiry of such a long time, there is no point to conduct enquiry/examination.

In view of facts and circumstances, particularly the fact that no cogent material has been brought on record that Respondent no.8 has produced any forged document, there is no reason to pass any favourable order.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

NKS/-

U			
---	--	--	--

