

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 9869 of 2022

1. Supriya Shree daughter of Sri Ratnesh Kumar Singh, resident of Mohalla Gayatri Nagar, Akharaghat, Police Station-Ahiyapur, District-Muzaffarpur.
2. Hema Kumari Daughter of Sri Mahendra Prasad Singh, resident of Amghatta Road, Ward No. 2, Dumra, Police Station-Dumra, District-Sitamarhi.
3. Kumari Nishi, Daughter of Sri Devesh Chandra Pandey, resident of Mohalla Mathiya, Motihari, Police Station-Chhatauni, District-East Champaran.
4. Govind Kumar Mishra, son of Sri Arun Kumar Mishra, resident of Kesariya Road, Chakia, Police Station-Chakia, District-East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Joint Secretary, Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, Panchayati Raj Department, Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, East Champaran-cum-Chairman, District Selection Committee, East Champaran.
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner-cum-Deputy Chairman, District Selection Committee, East Champaran.
7. The District Panchayati Raj Officer, East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr Ajay, GA V

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

3 02-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the respondents through Virtual Mode.

The petitioners' limited grievance is that in spite of decision of the District Selection Committee, East Champaran dated 26.11.2021, the selection is not being done.



The petitioners have approached the Director, Panchayati Raj Department, Bihar, Patna (Respondent No 4). However, the process of selection is not moving any further for want of Guidelines from Respondent No 4.

Under such circumstance, the petitioners seek disposal of their representation (Annexure 8) pending before Respondent No 4.

Learned State Counsel is not in a position to oppose the submission of the petitioners' counsel that Respondent No 4 is required to consider the petitioners' claim, irrespective of the final decision which may be taken in accordance with law.

In view of the above noted position, pendency of the writ petition would serve no useful purpose. Respondent No 4 shall take final decision on Annexure 8 within eight weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order and if the petitioners are found entitled to any benefits as a result of such consideration, the same shall also be granted to them within four weeks therefore.

Writ petition stands disposed of.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

U			
---	--	--	--

