

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No. 1221 of 2018

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1153 of 2016

=====

Lilawati Kumari @ Lilawati Devi wife of Sri Virendra Ravidas, resident of Village- Nadauri Baban Bigha, Ward No-9, Code No. 172, Police Station - Gurua, District- Gaya.

... .. Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary through the Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Main Secretariat, Patna – 800015.
2. The Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
3. The Block Development Officer, Gurua Block, Gaya.
4. The Child Development Program Officer, Gurua Block, Gaya.
5. The Panchayat Sewak, Nadauri Gram Panchayat, Gurua, Gaya.
6. The Mukhiya, Nadauri Gram Panchayat, Gurua, Gaya.
7. Sati Devi, wife of Umesh Yadav, resident of Village- Nadauri Baban Bigha, Ward No-9, Code No. 172, Police Station - Gurua, District- Gaya.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ajit Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha -Ga7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR)

4. 20-09-2019 Ofcourse, the present appeal has been listed under the heading “For Orders (On Petitions)” for considering the limitation petition i.e. I.A. No. 6563 of 2018, Sri Sandeep Kumar, learned counsel assisted by Sri Ajit Kumar, learned counsel for the appellant, in presence of Sri Gyan Prakash Ojha, learned Govt. Advocate – 7, submitted that the writ petitioner



has suppressed the fact that she had moved before the District Programme Officer, Gaya by filing a complaint petition, which after consideration stood dismissed. But such fact was not brought to the notice of the writ court, and as such, the appellant in the writ petition was not noticed.

In view of aforesaid fact, Sri Sandeep Kumar, learned counsel for the appellant requests for finally disposal of the present appeal, even under the heading “For Orders (On Petitions)”, so that the appellant, if so advised, may file a review petition. The submission made by learned counsel for the appellant was not disputed by Sri Gyan Prakash Ojha, learned Govt. Advocate – 7.

Accordingly, the L.P.A. under the heading “For Orders (On Petitions)”, with the consent of both the parties, stands disposed of.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J.)

anay

U			
---	--	--	--

