

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17265 of 2008

=====

Kumari Sujata Rani, wife of Sri Manoj Kumar Sinha, resident of Village
and post Rampur, P.S. Kahalgaon (Shiv Narainpur) District Bhojpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Director, Panchayati Raj, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat,
Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur
4. District Panchayati Raj Officer, Bhagalpur
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Kahalgaon, District Bhagalpur
6. Block Development Officer, Kahalgaon Block, District Bhagalpur
7. Smt. Manju Kumri, wife of Kumar Ram Pravesh Sinha, resident of
Village Jayantipur, P.O. Rampur, P.S. Kahalgaon, District Bhagalpur
8. Sri Ajit Kumar, the Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Rampur, P.S.
Kahalgaon, District Bhagalpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Brij Nandan Prasad
Mr. Brij Nandan Prasad

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Apurv Harsh. Ac to Sc 28

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

10 05-01-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

In the present case, petitioner is challenging the
appointment of respondent no.7, namely, Smt. Manju Kumari.

Petitioner and respondent no.7, namely, Smt. Manju
Kumari had applied for the post of Panchayat Secretary but
selection has been made to respondent no.7, not the petitioner.

Petitioner has raised a grievance that the Block
Development Officer has wrongly accepted the application of
respondent no.7 as she has given two dates of birth and



treating the date of birth to be correct in item no.6 she was wrongly appointed.

Learned counsel for the State, in contra, submits that respondent no.7 had filed two applications, one was defective and one was correct, both were listed in item nos. 4 and 6. Item No.4 was not taken into consideration being in-correct application but item no.6 was/is basis for selection. Petitioner has not stated in her pleading that she had filed two certificates where two certificates of dates of birth were filed. In the counter affidavit State has taken a plea that date of birth at item no.6 is correct.

In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any reason to interfere in the action of respondent no.7 and there is no merit in this writ petition.

Accordingly this writ petition is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Vinay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

