IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13929 of 2023

==

1. Dharmandra Kumar Jha, Son of Sri Madhu Kant Jha, Resident of Village- Jadupatti, P.O. Jadupatti, P.S. Ghanshyampur, District- Darbhanga.
2. Dhirendra Mishra, Son of Late Kedar Mishra, Resident of Village- Bansara, P.O. Pacharhi, P.S. Raiyam, District- Darbhanga.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Darbhanga.
5. The District Magistrate, Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.
6. Smt. Renu Devi, Wife of Shiv Narayan Yadav, Presently Chairman, Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, P.O., P.S. and District- Darbhanga.
7. Smt. Lalita Jha, Wife of Sri Alok Kumar Jha, Presently Vice Chairman, Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, P.O., P.S. and District- Darbhanga.
8. Smt. Pratibha Rani, Wife of not known to the petitioners, Presently posted as Deputy Development Commissioner -cum- Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.
9. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Darbhanga -cum- Additional Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, District- Darbhanga.

... ... Respondent/s

==

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. S. B. K. Mangalam, Advocate
	Mr. Awnish Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s :	Mr. Kameshwar Prasad Gupta, GP -10
	Mr. Satya Vrat, AC to GP-10
For Respondent Nos. 6 & 7:	Mr. Y.V. Giri, Sr. Advocate
	Mr. Devashish Giri, Advocate
For Respondent Nos. 8 & 9:	Mr. Vivek Prasad, Advocate

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 04-12-2023

Heard Mr. S. B. K. Mangalam, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, Mr. Y.V. Giri, learned senior counsel, duly assisted by Mr. Devashish Giri, learned counsel for respondent nos. 6 and 7 and Mr. Vivek Prasad, learned counsel representing the respondent nos. 8 and 9. The State is represented by Mr. Satya Vrat, learned AC to GP-

2. The petitioners, who are elected members of Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, have filed the present writ petition invoking the prerogative writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:

> "(I) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS commanding and directing the Respondent nos. 1 to 3 to take suitable disciplinary and penal action against the Respondent nos. 6 to 9 for misappropriation and illegal withdrawal of money from Zila Parishad fund without any budgetary provision as contemplated under Section 84 of the Bihar Panchayat Raj Act, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as the Gram Panchayat Act.)
>
> (II) For a declaration that in view of the provision contained under Section 2 (a) (n) read with Section 81 and 84 of the Gram Panchayat Act and the provisions contained under Article 243(d) of the Constitution of India any withdrawal from the funds of Zila Parishad without sanction of Zila Parishad through the budgetary provision by the Respondent nos. 6 to 8 would amount to misappropriation of Zila Parishad fund and, therefore, appropriate penal action has to be

> taken against them by the Respondent nos. 1, 2 and 3 not only for misappropriation of funds of Zila Parishad but also for misuse of power by them when they have no power for withdrawal of any amount without the sanction of Zila Parishad.
>
> (III) For issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions for which the writ petitioners would be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, while highlighting the aim and object of 73rd Constitutional Amendment, 1992 by which Chapter IX (Panchayat) was inserted in the constitution and after 73rd Constitutional amendment the Gram Panchayats were given the status of constitutional democratic at the grass root level, submitted that under Section 62(1) of Gram Panchayat Act provisions were made for establishment of Zila Parishad and under Sub-Section 2 of Section 62, every Zila Parishad was conferred the status of body corporate by the name of its Zila Parishad with perpetual succession and common seal and signature, shall consist of the members enumerated under Section 63 of the Act. He further by referring to Section 81 of the Gram Panchayat Act submits that the provision has been made for constitution of Zila Parishad fund in the name of Zila Parishad, which are consisting of all

the contributions and grants, fees, fines and all the sums received by or on behalf of the Zila Parishad as enumerated therein. Section 84 of the Gram Panchayat Act provides for Budget of Zila Parishad, which contemplates that Zila Parishad shall at such time and in such manner, as may be prescribed, prepare in each year a budget of its estimated receipts and disbursement for the following year and the same will be passed by the majority of the members present in the meeting and quorum for such meeting was not less than 50% of the total numbers of the members.

4. After highlighting the various relevant provisions, inter alia, noted hereinabove, it is submitted that the Zila Parishad, Darbhanga has been constituted by general Panchayat Election 2021 and after receiving the return after 2021 Election from its different territorial constituency, the respondent no.6 was elected as the Chairman of the Zila Parishad and respondent no. 7 as the Vice-Chairman. Despite the constitution of the Zila Parishad w.e.f. 03.01.2022 two financial years have gone i.e.2022-23 and 2023-24, however, till date no budget has been prepared for the Zila Parishad, though crores of money has been withdrawn by respondent nos. 6 and 8 and spent without there being any budgetary provision and

sanction of Zila Parishad is *per se* illegal, resulted into financial anarchy.

5. Mr. Mangalam next submits that it is the high time that the State Government would raise to occasion to consider the complaint of the aggrieved members of the Zila Parishad, if they have brought it to the notice of the State Government that serious financial irregularities are being committed by the respondent nos. 6 and 8 but it is unfortunate that despite the representation filed by the petitioners pointedly highlighting the fact that any expenditure from the Zila Parishad fund without any budget for 2020-21 to 2023-24 would nothing, but misappropriation of public money, however the serious issue has neither been taken up by the State Government nor it was made an agenda for the Zila Parishad. He further submits that despite the undertaking given by respondent no.6 in the proceeding dated 07.11.2022 that she would convene a Special Meeting of Zila Parishad for sanction of supplementary budget for the financial year 2021-22 and for consideration of budget of financial year 2022-23 neither any special meeting has been convened for sanction of budget for financial year 2022-23 nor any supplementary budget for the financial year 2021-22 has been placed in any meeting of the Zila Parishad for its approval.

However, without there being any provision in the budget in the meeting dated 11.09.2023, the respondent no.8 had placed before the Zila Parishad long list of schemes, which the respondent nos. 6 and 8 have sanctioned for different territorial constituencies under Darbhanga Zila Parishad, as per their whims and fancies and further pressure was created upon the members of the Zila Parishad to accept the list so that the scheme can be implemented in absence of any budgetary provision and without preparation of any detailed project report by the District Planning Committee.

6. It is pointed out that the schemes mentioned in the list produced by respondent nos. 6 and 8 have never been sanctioned by the Zila Parishad, yet the list was prepared with the estimated cost, but admittedly without any project report. The petitioners further drawing the attention of this Court to the constitution of Bihar District Planning Committee and Conduct of Business Rules, 2006 have submitted that the Rules envisages therein that it is the Committee, who has to finalize the draft development plan for the district that the functionaries under the Rules would proceed with the schemes, falling in their jurisdiction for its completion for expanding the fund, but up till now no District Planning Committee has been constituted for

the district of Darbhanga, yet the funds of Zila Parishad are being spent by the Executive Officer in connivance with the elected Chairperson of local bodies and few members.

7. Mr. Mangalam, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that discrimination has been caused in sanctioning the schemes for territorial constituencies. Since the power for selection for schemes for whole district has been vested in the District Planning Committee and it is only after the District Planning Committee, who is the final authority to prepare the list of the schemes for development of the district and after being adopted by the District Panchayat Planning Committee and the Zila Parishad it can be uploaded on the portal of Zila Parishad and can be executed. Thus, the list of the schemes produced by respondent nos. 6 and 8 in the meeting of Zila Parishad dated 11.09.2023 ought to be turned down. The withdrawal from the funds of Zila Parishad, Darbhanga by such an authorized manner is misappropriation of public money, for which they are liable to be prosecuted and also deserve departmental action, including removal of respondent nos. 6 and 7 from the post under Section 70(5) of the Bihar Panchayat Raj Act, 2006.

8. The petitioners have also filed interlocutory

applications bearing I.A. No. 1 of 2023 and I.A. 2 of 2023 seeking quashing of the notice dated 16.09.2023, issued under the signature of respondent no.8, contained in Memo No. 790 dated 16.09.2023 whereby the respondent no.8 has been pleased to issue notice to the members of Zila Parishad for their participation in the meeting of Zila Parishad scheduled to be held on 27.09.2023 on the ground that the last meeting for consideration of the same agenda was placed for consideration by the Zila Parishad on 11.09.2023 and in view of the provisions contained under Rule 37(1)(iii) and (iv) of Bihar Panchayat Raj Institutions (Conduct of Business) Rules, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Rules, 2015'), such agenda cannot be again placed before the Zila Parishad for consideration before the expiry of three months from the last meeting of Zila Parishad, in which those agendas are placed for consideration by Zila Parishad. The petitioners also sought a direction upon the respondent no.8 to produced on record the proceeding of the meeting dated 27.09.2023 of Zila Parishad, Darbhanga in which the 297 schemes were placed for consideration and on production, the same may be quashed.

9. Per contra, Mr. Y.V. Giri, learned senior counsel representing the respondent nos. 6 and 7 while refuting

the contention of the petitioners primarily submitted that the present writ petition is not at all maintainable and the petitioners have no locus standi, as they have filed the writ petition in individual capacity when they are themselves an elected member of the Zila Parishad, Darbhanga. Moreover, the present writ application is nothing, but filed in the garb of Public Interest Litigation. He further submits that the Zila Parishad is a body corporate vested with the capacity of suing or being sued in its corporate name, but the petitioners have not made Zila Parishad, Darbhanga as a party respondents in the present case, due to which the writ petition is liable to be dismissed. Further submission has been made that the petitioners being the elected members and authority of Zila Parishad, they are certainly raised their grievance in connection with the Act and Rule, but not to invoke the prerogative writ jurisdiction of the writ court for regulating the internal administration of the Zila Parishad, which is not open for judicial review. All the more, they have alternative remedy, as provided under Sections 70 as well as Section 154 of the Bihar Panchayat Raj Act, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act, 2006').

10. While responding to the submissions made on behalf of the petitioners, he submits that as per Section 88(3)

of the Act, 2006, the Chief Accounts Officer is responsible for all matters relating to the accounts of the Zila Parishad including preparation of annual accounts and the budget. However, till date no Chief Accounts Officer has been appointed by the Government in any Zila Parishad across the districts of Bihar, including Zila Parishad, Darbhanga. Thus, in absence of the Chief Accounts Officer, the respondent nos. 6 and 7 cannot be blamed for preparing the budget of Zila Parishad. He further drew the provisions of Section 88(4) of the Act, 2006 and with reference thereto he submits that from bare reading of Section 88(4) of the Act, 2006 becomes clear that the word "or" in the last line of Clause (4) has been used in a disjunctive manner which shows that there are two ways in which expenditure may be incurred by the Zila Parishad; first is the type of expenditure, which is warranted by the Act, Rules and Regulation; second is the expenditure for which a provision is required to be made in the budget. The Zila Parishad, Darbhanga has three main sources through which it receives fund (i) Union Finance Commission, (ii) State Finance Commission and (iii) own source revenue. Both the aforementioned funds received from the Union Government and the State Government have to be spent by the Zila Parishad in the manner as prescribed by the guidelines issued from the department of Central and State Government, which allocates the funds by different types and categories of schemes.

11. In order to buttress this submission, certain letters issued by the Monitoring Officer, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar as well as letter of Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar, have been brought on record. He further submits that so far the withdrawal of money by the respondent nos. 6 and 8 and its expenditure without sanction of Zila Parishad is concerned, it is the fact that no money has been withdrawn or spent by respondent no.6 and 8 for the schemes of Union Finance Commission and State Finance Commission without the sanction of the Zila Parishad. All the funds for the schemes have been allocated and spent after obtaining the sanction of Zila Parishad by convening meeting each time. For allocation of funds of Union Finance Commission for the financial year 2020-21 and 2021-22, the supplementary list of schemes was approved by the Zila Parishad, Darbhanga in the meeting held on 11.09.2023. He further submits that similarly for the financial year 2022-23 and financial year 2023-24, the list of scheme was approved by the sanction of Zila Parishad, Darbhanga in the

meeting held on 09.02.2022 and 27.09.2023 respectively. He next submitted that in fact no representation has ever been received by the respondent no.6 from the petitioner no.2 and the submission made on behalf of the petitioners that they had raised the issue of preparation of budget in the meeting of Zila Parishad held on 03.06.2023 is manifestly false. In the said representation, there is only information regarding budget and allocation of fund. Had the petitioner no.2 was genuinely entrusted to issue the budget in the list, he would have given a notice of a special meeting along with other members to discuss the issue of budget, but no such special meeting was requested to be called for.

12. Learned senior counsel, Mr. Giri, while referring to the correspondences and letters/representations of the petitioners has demonstrated that the petitioners were never interested in budget of Zila Parishad, but in fact the representation dated 08.09.2023 was ploy at the hands of the petitioners, who wanted only to disrupt the meeting of Zila Parishad on 11.09.2023. The conduct of the petitioners speak volume, as since 2021, the petitioners had never raised any query regarding the budget, but just three days before the meeting the petitioner no.2 gave a representation to disrupt the

proceeding of the meeting dated 11.09.2023 in order to make a cause of action for filing the present writ petition on 13.09.2023. Mr. Giri while responding the issue raised by the petitioners, with respect to sanctioning of schemes in absence of preparation of detailed project report by the District Planning Committee, has submitted that the Government has not constituted a District Planning Committee in any district across the Bihar, including Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, and moreover as per Section 167 of the Act, 2006, it is the Government to constitute in every district a District Planning Committee to consolidate the plans prepared by the Panchayats and Municipalities in the district and to prepare a draft development plan for the district as a whole. He further reiterated that so far the funds under Union Finance Commission and State Finance Commission are concerned, those are exclusively for the Zila Parishad, for which guidelines are also issued by the Government delineating the manner and schemes, in which the funds are to be utilized, thus the schemes under Union Finance Commission and State Finance Commission, no preparation of such schemes by the District Planning Committee is required. He lastly submitted that the petitioners and few of the members are only interested to stall the welfare and development works for their ulterior motive to somehow getting huge funds for their constituencies and create pressure on respondent nos. 6 and 7, for their nefarious ends or to somehow get the respondent nos. 6 and 7 removed from the post of Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The petitioners are not remediless, as has been explained in the aforegoing paragraphs.

13. Similarly, Mr. Vivek Prasad, learned counsel representing the respondent nos. 8 and 9 while adopting the submissions made by the learned senior counsel Mr. Y.V. Giri, on behalf of respondent nos. 6 and 7, added further submissions to oppose the contention of the petitioners that the petitioners have already filed representation before the concerned department, Government of Bihar and they ought to pursue their remedy within the ambit of statutory provisions laid down under Section 154, read with Section 160(2) of the Act, 2006. He submits that the Zila Parishad, Darbhanga is functioning with the help of Government aid/fund under the heading 15th Union Finance Commission and (6th and 5th) State Financial Commission along with own source revenue and the funds received from the Union Government and State Government have to be spent by the Zila Parishad in accordance to the guidelines issued by the Central Government and State Government respectively. Since the own income source of Zila

Parishad, Darbhanga is much less than its expenditure, the same is adjusted from the received fund. He also reiterates the submissions made on behalf of the respondent nos. 6 and 7 that no such Chief Accounts Officer has been appointed by the Government in Zila Parishad, Darbhanga and in absence of the same for proper exercise of functions of Zila Parishad certain budgets have been prepared and sanctioned/approved by the majority of the house of Zila Parishad, on earlier occasions for financial years as and when required. It has been clarified that proposal no.7 of the general meeting dated 07.11.2023 contains the fact that for making supplementary budget for the financial year 2021-22 and the original budget for the financial year 2022-23, a resolution has been passed that through special meeting, the aforesaid budgets shall be sanctioned, which is still awaited, since the above decision taken in the general meeting dated 07.11.2023, the petitioners have given representation for convening of Special meeting, but preparation and approval of budget have not been included in the list of agenda provided by the petitioners. He further clarified the position that within the ambit of statutory provisions, Section 88 (2) of the Act, 2006, the Chief Executive Officer is duty bond to attend the meeting of Zila Parishad and has to make a proper assistance to the extent of execution of works, which have been imposed upon him and thus the respondent Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Darbhanga has adopted the same and has performed its respective parts, as and when requires. It is also submitted that against the scheme/agenda, which have already been approved by the majority of the house of the Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, the respondent Deputy Development Commissioner-cum- Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Darbhanga has drawn and disbursed the money of Zila Parishad, Darbhanga funds to the concerned territorial constituency of Zila Parishad for the implementation of the approved schemes and accordingly the allegation by the petitioners relating to misappropriation of Zila Parishad fund is unfounded and against the actual state of affairs.

14. At last, Mr. Prasad, learned counsel for respondent nos. 8 and 9 drew the attention of this Court to the list of the schemes and the particulars showing the amount allotted under the scheme and with reference thereto he submits that both the petitioners have been allotted various funds for the schemes under their constituencies and thus the action of the petitioners are barred by estoppel and acquiescence. At one hand they are receiving the funds for the execution of schemes

allotted to their constituency and at the same time they are challenging the action of the respondent nos. 6 to 9, which is not permissible under the law. Mr. Prasad, while concluding his submission in order to strengthen his submission that the power of judicial review ought not to be exercised in a situation where public interest is affected at large and the decision of the authority is, prima facie, not perverse and/or arbitrary and/or suffers from malafide or favouritism. He made reliance upon a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **National High Speed Rail Corpn. Ltd. v. Montecarlo Ltd.**, reported in **(2022) 6 SCC 401**.

15. Mr. Satya Vrat, learned counsel for the State has adopted the submissions made on behalf of respondent nos.6 to 9.

16. Before going into the merit of the case, as certain points have been raised with regard to the maintainability of the present writ petition on the ground inter alia, the petitioners, being the members of the Zila Parishad, having no locus standi to file the present writ petition and further the petitioners having alternative remedy provided in the Act, 2006, the present writ petition is not maintainable, all the more, the dispute as has been raised in the present writ petition

is in the nature of Public Interest Litigation the same is required to be answered at first instance.

17. Admittedly, the petitioners are elected members of the Zila Parishad, Darbhanga, who have been participated in all the meetings and have been raising grievances with regard to the affairs of the Zila Parishad in accordance with law, as provided under the Act and the Rules and the disputes which are required to be resolved in the House of the Zila Parishad, the same has been brought before this Court.

18. It is worth noted here that the Bihar Panchayat Raj Act, 2006 is a self contained Act to regulate the affairs of the institutions at the Panchayat Level, including the Zila Parishad. The legislature has already framed the provisions for check and balance, if the Zila Parishad or its members failed to perform its duties and functions under the Act or abuses the power vested in him and is found to be guilty of misconduct in discharge of his duties. It has rightly been noted that Section 154 of the Act, 2006 empowers the State Government, which may, either of its own motion or on an application from any person interested, call for and examine the records or of a Standing Committee, including the Finance audit and Planning Committee was to satisfy itself as to the correctness, legality or

propriety of any decision or order passed therein or as to the regularity of such proceedings.

19. Further Section 160(2) of the Act, 2006 contemplates that if the Government is in the opinion that the Zila Parishad exceeds or abuses its powers or is not competent to perform or makes persistent default in the performance of the duties imposed upon it under this Act or by any other law for the time being in force, the Government may, by an order published in the Official Gazette, dissolve a Zila Parishad. Furthermore, Section 70 of the Act, 2006 also provides a procedure of No Confidence Motion to remove the Chairman and Vice-chairman in case of their absence without sufficient cause for more than three consecutive meetings/sittings or willfully omits or refuses to perform his duties and functions under this Act, or abuses the power vested in him or is found to be guilty of misconduct in the discharge of his duties.

20. Irrespective of all the statutory remedial provisions, as provided under the Act, the filing of the present writ petition invoking prerogative writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution without availing the same in the opinion of this Court is not maintainable.

21. This Court also takes note of the fact that not

only the petitioners are members of the Zila Parishad but they are also beneficiary of the allotted funds allocated from the Union Government and the State Government, and thus the petitioners cannot be allowed to blow hot and cold simultaneously and reprobate or aprobate at the same time. The law is very clear in this regard "an action at law is not a game of chess. A litigant who comes to Court and invokes its writ jurisdiction must come with clean hands. He cannot prevaricate and take inconsistent position."

22. This Court further finds that it has rightly been submitted that the scope of judicial review ought to be on a limited aspect i.e. the action of the public authority does not suffer from favouritism or nepotism and based on the grounds which have been concealed from the financing authority, if disclosed, would have persuaded the financing authority to cancel the contract and the Court should be extremely cogent and circumspect in exercise of its discretion while entertaining petitions and/or while granting stay in such matters, if it would affect the public interest. Reliance placed upon a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **National High Speed Rail Corporation Limited Vs. Montecarlo Limited & Anr., (2022) 6 SCC 401**, especially, pararaph 48 is

quoted hereinbelow:

> "48. Even while entertaining the writ petition and/or granting the stay which ultimately may delay the execution of the Mega projects, it must be remembered that it may seriously impede the execution of the projects of public importance and disables the State and/or its agencies/instrumentalities from discharging the constitutional and legal obligation towards the citizens. Therefore, the High Courts should be extremely careful and circumspect in exercise of its discretion while entertaining such petitions and/or while granting stay in such matters. Even in a case where the High Court is of the prima facie opinion that the decision is as such perverse and/or arbitrary and/or suffers from mala fides and/or favouritism, while entertaining such writ petition and/or pass any appropriate interim order, High Court may put to the writ petitioner's notice that in case the petitioner loses and there is a delay in execution of the project due to such proceedings initiated by him/it, he/they may be saddled with the damages caused for delay in execution of such projects, which may be due to such frivolous litigations initiated by him/it. With these words of caution and advise, we rest the matter there and leave it to the wisdom of the concerned Court(s), which ultimately may look to the larger public interest and the national interest involved."

23. It would be worth noted here that every Zila Parishad shall be a body corporate by the name of its Zila Parishad and shall have perpetual succession and a common seal and, subject to such restrictions, as are imposed by or under this Act or any other enactment, shall be vested with the capacity of suing or being sued in its corporate name. Thus, in absence of the Zila Parishad, as a party respondent, the points raised in the writ petition cannot be adjudicated, as any decision passed by this Court shall affect the rights, liability and affairs of the Zila Parishad.

24. This Court is also not oblivious of the fact that before approaching this Court, the petitioners have filed their representations before the competent authority of the State Government, but as the same has not been taken into consideration and brought to its logical conclusion, the petitioners' left with no option, but to file the present writ petition. In fact, the dispute raised in the case in hand is nothing but a self-created chaos at the hands of the State Government and its authorities by not appointing the Chief Accounts Officer or constituting the District Planning Committee in the Zila Parishad and now sitting over the matter as mute spectator.

25. In view of the aforenoted reasons, as

discussed herein, this Court restrained itself to enter into the merit of this case and dispose of the writ petition with liberty to the petitioners to raise their grievance before the Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar by filing a fresh representation detailing the allegations. If the same is done within a period of four weeks from today, the respondent no.2 shall be obliged to get the matter enquire into and pass necessary order in accordance with law expeditiously considering the urgency of the matter.

26. It is needless to observe that in the meantime, the State Government shall also take steps in the matter of appointment of Chief Accounts Officer and the constitution of District Planning Committee in order to run the function and affairs of Zila Parishad properly.

27. This disposes the writ petition.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	06.12.2023
Transmission Date	NA