

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16632 of 2018

=====

Raj Kumar Son of Late Shyam Bihari Prasad, resident of Village-
Hathiyakandh, P.O.- Sarai, P.S.- Shahpur, Anchal Prakhand Sub Division-
Danapur, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Commissioner, Patna Pramandal, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Patna
4. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna
5. The Sub- Division Officer, Buxar
6. The S.H.O. Shahpur, P.S.- Patna
7. The Circle Officer, Danapur, Patna.
8. The Officer In Charge, General Administration, Patna Collectorate, Patna.
9. The Mukhia Sri Rabindra Kumar, Son of Late Sudama Rai, resident of
Village- Laxshmi Chak, P.O. Sarai, P.S. Shahpur, District Patna.
10. The Sarpanch- Bindeshwari Parsad, Son of Late Kashi Mahto, resident of
Village P.O.- Shikarpur, P.S.- Shahpur, District- Patna.
11. Gayanand Singh, S/o Late Biteshwar Singh, R/o- Hathiyakandh, P.S.
Shahpur, District- Patna.
12. Dayanand Singh Son of Late Yadu Nandan Singh, resident of Village-
Hathiyakandh, P.S.- Shahpur, District- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Pramod Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Md. Nadim Seraj- Gp5
For Private Respondent/s:		Mr.Sunil Kumar
		Mr.Navin Sharma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

4 18-02-2020 It is the petitioner's case that one Dayanand Singh was appointed as the Dafadar of Mahal No. 4, Hathiyakandh Grampanchayat under Shahpur P.S. (Danapur), who subsequently joined Indian Railways against some post. He alleges that one Gayanand Singh (respondent no.11)



impersonating as Dayanand Singh and is acting as the Dafadar of the said Mahal No. 4 of Hathiyakandh Grampanchayat.

2. There is representation on behalf of the contesting respondent no. 11 and learned GP-5 appears for the State of Bihar.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 11 has submitted that malicious statements has been made in the writ application and the matter has already been inquired into by the authorities at appropriate level and that the allegation has been found to be baseless.

4. Be that as it may, considering the nature of dispute, which the petitioner intends to raise in the present writ application, no interference is required by this Court in exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. It will be open for the respondents to examine and proceed accordingly.

6. This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

AKASH/-

U			
---	--	--	--

