

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11039 of 2023

=====

Raju Kumar Sah Son of Ritlal Sah, Resident of Village- Keshopur, Dadpur,
P.S.- Jhajha, Distt.- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Jamui.
3. The District Panchayati Raj Officer, Jamui.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Munger.
5. The Block Development Officer, Jhajha, Distt.- Jamui.
6. The Block Panchayati Raj Officer-cum- Executive Officer, (Panchayat Samittee), Jhajha, District- Jamui.
7. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat, Keshopur, P.S.- Jhajha, District- Jamui.
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Keshopur, P.S.- Jhajha, District- Jamui.
9. Smt. Anita Kumari, ward member, ward no. 05, Gram Panchayat Raj, Keshopur, P.S.- Jhajha, District- Jamui.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Mishra, Advocate.
For the Respondent/s : Smt. Archana Meenakshee (Gp6)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 16-01-2024

Heard Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra, learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the petitioner and learned AC to GP-6 for

the State.

2. Petitioner has filed the present writ petition for

the relief as prayed for in Para-1 which, *inter alia*, is as follows:

“That the present writ petition is being filed for a
direction to the respondents concerned to ensure the facilities
whatsoever is required and permissible as per law including to
open and operation of joint bank Account, to the petitioner with
ward member for performing his duty as secretary of the Ward
No.05 of Panchayat Raj Keshopur, P.S.-Jhajha, District – Jamui



to run and to facilitate the benefits of the Govt. Scheme to the public of the ward aforesaid.”

3. Petitioner is aggrieved by the action of the respondent no.9 - ward member of Ward No.5 of Panchayat Raj Keshopur, District – Jamui, who has deliberately not opened a joint bank account which has impeded the public work and implementation of welfare scheme. Specific statement in this regard has been made in Para-11, 12 and 13 of the writ petition that the respondent no.9 is adamant not to cooperate with the petitioner in implementation of the government scheme in favour of the public of the Panchayat. The petitioner is also aggrieved by the action of the respondent no.6 – the Block Panchayat Raj Officer who in connivance with respondent no.9 has tried to restrict the petitioner from operating the joint bank account. The allegation as made against respondent nos. 6 and 9 are required to be referred to the Panchayati Raj Department for taking necessary action, particularly, against respondent no.9 for her removal.

4. Learned State counsel referring to Para-5 and the action taken as stated in Para-11 submits that the writ petition has become infructuous. The District Panchayat Raj Officer has already taken action by recommending for removal of the respondent no.9 to the State Government. The Panchayat



Secretary has been appointed on 07.01.2024 and no interference is required.

5. Considering the aforesaid information, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

mantreshwar/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	16.01.2024
Transmission Date	N.A.

