

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1163 of 2015

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4767 of 2015

Suchita Kumari D/o Dinanath Sah resident of Gudri Bazar, Hazipur, P.S.
Town, District - Vaishali

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Commissioner Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur
2. The Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur
3. The District Magistrate, Hazipur
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Hazipur, Vaishali
5. The District Project Officer, Hazipur, Vaishali
6. The Child Development Project officer, Bidupur, Vaishali

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	M/s Mukeshwar Dayal and Vikas Mohan, Advocates
For the Respondent/s	:	Mrs. Vinit Singh, SC 28 and Mr. Kumar Kamalnayan, AC to SC 28

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN)

Date : 04-10-2017

Heard learned counsel for the appellant and the State.

The grievance of the appellant is that her contract for Aganwari Supervisor was not extended though such benefit was extended to the others.

From perusal of the impugned order, it appears that contract was not extended on the ground that her work was not found satisfactory.



A view has been taken by the learned Single Judge that since the contract has been annulled by the competent authority and upheld by the Divisional Commissioner, the remedy will be proper forum for breach of contract and not a direction or mandamus. In our view, in the intra court appeal, if two views are possible and one of such views has been taken by the learned Single Judge then ordinarily the matter does not warrant interference. However, in the present matter we do not see any reason for disagreement with the views expressed by learned Single Judge.

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

(S. Kumar, J)

Spd/-

AFR/NAFR	NA
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	11.10.2017
Transmission Date	NA

