

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2533 of 2018

=====

Mukesh Kumar Son of Late Tej Narayan Yadav, Resident of Village- Milik Pokhar Kanna, Police Station- Manihari, District- Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Director, Agriculture Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Joint Director, Purnia Division, Purnia.
4. The District Magistrate, Katihar.
5. The District Agriculture Officer, Katihar.
6. The Block Development Officer, Manihari, District- Katihar.
7. The Block Agriculture Officer, Manihari, District- Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Nilotpal Sharma, AC to G.A.-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 18-09-2023 Heard the parties.

2, By this writ application, the petitioner prays for issuance of appropriate writ/writs, order/orders and direction / directions upon the respondent authorities for the quashing of Memo no. 1355 dated 01.09.2017 issued under the signature of Respondent no. 5 whereby and whereunder he has been terminated from the post of 'KISAN SALAHKAR' and also quashing of order dated 09.12.2017 passed in Appeal Case No.01 of 2017-2018 passed by respondent no. 3 whereby and



where under the appeal off the petitioner dismissed.

3. It is the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that though the order in question (Memo no. 1355 dated 01.09.2017) talks about the order dated 01.09.2017 of the District Magistrate without providing the same as to what was the reason, the District Agriculture Officer, Katihar has passed the order. He as such, submits that since no such order is on record, he may be permitted to move before the District Magistrate, Katihar for the redressal of his grievance.

4. A counter affidavit has been filed by the District Agriculture Officer, Katihar. Though the reply is in line with the order, a perusal of the same would show that it has been passed as per the direction of the District Magistrate, Katihar which however has not been brought on record in the counter affidavit.

5. Learned counsel for the State submits that his services were dispensed with only after an audio became viral in which he was asking bribe from the framers. He as such justified the order in question.

6. In that view of the matter liberty is granted to the petitioner to move before the District Magistrate, Katihar within a period of four weeks from today for redressal of his grievance.

7. If the said representation is filed, an appropriate



order be passed at an earliest.

8. The writ petition stands disposed of with the
aforesaid observations.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Jagdish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

