

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.273 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11149 of 2014

=====

Rajni Kumari Wife of Sri Satish Kumar Resident of New Bengali Tola, Postal Park, Police Station Jakkanpur in the District of Patna.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Director, I.C.D.S. Directors, Directorate, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Patna.
4. The Deputy Director, Welfare, Patna Division, Patna.
5. The District Programme Officer, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Sanjeev Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

Date : 25-07-2022

Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

In the instant L.P.A., appellant has assailed the order of the learned single Judge dated 06.12.2017 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 11149 of 2014.

The learned single Judge order reads as under:-

“The petitioner had earlier moved this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 6103 of 2013 challenging his removal from the post of Anganbari Sevika which was withdrawn vide order dated 12.4.2013 with liberty to file an appeal before the Collector, Patna. Having obtained such



liberty, it appears that the petitioner preferred appeal bearing Anganbari Appeal No. 89 of 2013-14 before the Appellate authority, i.e., the Deputy Director, Welfare, Patna Division, Patna (respondent no. 4). A copy of the said appeal has not been brought on record by the petitioner. However, it is pointed out that the issues raised in the appeal, has not been considered.

On perusal of the appellate order dated 16.12.2013, it appears that the matter was considered by a reasoned order. In absence of a copy of the appeal, it is not possible for the Court to examine what contentions had been raised by the petitioner which have not been considered as alleged by the petitioner. Order of the appellate authority appears to be a reasoned order, passed after considering the various points and after hearing the counsel for the appellant.

In view of the aforesaid discussion, there does not appear any reason to interfere with the impugned order. The writ petition is thus dismissed.”

2. The appeal was presented in the year 2018. After perusal of the order of the learned single Judge, appellant counsel should have furnished copy of the memorandum of appeal filed by the appellant before the appellate authority so as to examine what are the contentions taken by the appellant. For the last four years, the appellant has not furnished the same in order to examine contents of the memorandum of appeal. There is no assistance in the matter.



3. Accordingly, the present L.P.A. stands dismissed
for want of materials.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Rajiv Roy, J)

rakhi/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	30.07.2022
Transmission Date	

