

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4667 of 2023**

=====

Sunil Kumar Singh, Son of Late Ramadhar Singh, Resident of Village - Akodhi, Panchayat- Pokhaha, P.S. - Bagel Gola, District - Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Joint Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Buxar.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Buxar.
5. The Block Development Officer, Brahmpur, Buxar.
6. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Pokhaha, Block - Brahmapur, District- Buxar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate  
For the State : Mr. Rewti Kant Suman, AC to SC-11

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      25-09-2023                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner's selection, as per averments made in the writ petition, for discharging the function of a Sanitary Inspector under a scheme, was rejected at the meeting of the Gram Sabha on 02.07.2022. This is an admitted position as per Annexure-4 to the writ petition itself.

3. The petitioner has filed the instant writ petition seeking a direction upon the respondents to consider his candidature for the post of Sanitary Inspector. He claims to have



been discharging work of a Swachtagrahi since 2016.

4. From the averments and documents made in the writ petition, learned counsel for the petitioner cannot show that the petitioner has ever been appointed on any post. Some experience certificates have been placed on record which are to the effect that he was associated with the cleanliness work being carried on under the Lohiya Swachh Bihar Abhiyaan (LSBA).

5. The rejection of petitioner's candidature for Sanitary Inspector on 02.07.2022 has also never been assailed by the petitioner. Even in the instant proceedings, the same has not been put to challenge.

6. In view thereof, this court does not find that the petitioner has any enforceable right for which any direction can be issued in these proceedings by exercising extraordinary and discretionary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in favour of the petitioner.

7. The writ petition is misconceived and the same is accordingly dismissed.

**(Madhuresh Prasad, J)**

shashank/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

