

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16089 of 2016

=====

Lal Babu Prasad son of Late Ram Briksh Sah Resident of Village-Sarsaula,
Police Station-Lakhara, District-East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Patna
3. The Director, Panchayati Raj Department, New Secretariat, Patna
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, East Champaran at Motihari
6. The Collector/District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari, District-East Champaran
7. The District Treasury Officer, East Champaran at Motihari
8. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Pakari Dayal, District-East Champaran at Motihari
9. The District Panchayati Raj Officer, Enquiry Officer, Motihari, East Champaran
10. The Block Development Officer, Madhuban, Block Madhuban, District-East Champaran at Motihari

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kameshwar Pd. Gupta- GP10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 18-06-2020 This matter has been taken up through virtual Court proceeding.

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

The present writ application has been filed for setting aside the order of suspension of the petitioner issued vide memo no. 1484 dated 3.11.2012 by the respondent no. 6, the District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari, as contained in



Annexure 1, whereby the petitioner, who was working on the post of Panchayat Secretary, Dulma Panchayat, Madhuban block in the district of East Champaran, has been put under suspension along with others.

In the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondent no. 2, the specific stand has been taken in paragraph 5 thereof that the order of suspension of the petitioner has already been vacated vide Memo No. 465 dated 24.4.2017. Paragraph 5 of the counter affidavit reads as follows:

“That the suspension of the writ petitioner has been vacated vide order contained in Memo No. 465 dated 24.04.2017. Now this writ application has become infructuous. The payment for the period of suspension will depend on the result of the departmental proceeding.”

In view of the above stand of the respondent no. 2, this writ application has become infructuous.

This writ application is, accordingly, disposed of as it has become infructuous.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

anil/-

U			
---	--	--	--

