

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18817 of 2014

Nilam Kumari wife of Sanjay Kumar, resident of village- Kumbhi, P.S.-
Bankey Bazar, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar, through Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources, New Secretariat, Bihar Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Gaya
3. The District Education Officer, Gaya
4. The District Programme Officer of Secondary Education and Literacy, Gaya
5. The Block Education Officer, Bankey Bazar, Gaya
6. The President, Village/Tola Committee, null Primary School, Kumbhi, P.S.- Bankey Bazar, District- Gaya
7. The Village/Tola Committee, Primary School, Kumbhi, P.S.- Bankey Bazar, District- Gaya through its Secretary
8. The Head Master, Primary School, Kumbhi, P.S.- Bankey Bazar, District- Gaya
9. Arun Das, son of Late Kameshwar Das, Resident of Village- Kumbhi, P.S.- Bankey Bazar, District- Gaya

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajesh Singh, GP-16

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 02-11-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner by filing the instant application has
challenged the appointment of the private respondent no.9 as
Tola Sewak by the respondent authorities.

3. It is contention of the learned counsel for the
petitioner that the said appointment has been made in violation
of the guidelines laid down by the respondents for such



appointment.

4. Bereft of the unnecessary details, on perusal of the letter of appointment of respondent no.9 as contained in Annexure-3 to the writ application it transpires that pursuant to meeting of the Samiti held on 31.1.2014, the respondent no.9 was appointed for a period of one year on payment of an honorarium of Rs.2500 per month. It further transpires that so far as the extension of service of the said respondent no.9 is concerned, decision was to be taken by the authority concerned based on the success of his work.

5. In the opinion of this Court, the service of respondent no.9 having come to an end on completion of a period of one year sometime in the year 2015, nothing remains to be decided by the Court in the instant writ application. So far as extension of the service of respondent no.9 is concerned, there is no such statement/affidavit as to whether the said respondent no.9 continues in the said capacity.

6. In view of the application having been infructuous, the same is dismissed.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

ajay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

