

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13130 of 2014

1. Jan Kalayan Samiti
2. Dr. Mamta Anand, Secretary W/o Shri Anand Tripathi resident of Chiriyatand, Khasmahal, Road No. 3, Patna 800001.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Joint Secretary cum Director, Nagar Vikas Avum Awas Vibhag, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Kanti Nagar Panchayat, Muzaffarpur through its Chief Executive Officer.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Kanti Nagar Panchayat, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binod Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Ga9-A.K.Sinha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

4 08-08-2024 1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief(s):-

“2(i) An appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondents especially respondents 3 & 4 to make payment of the dues mentioned in Annexure-12 within a time frame, be issued.

(ii) An appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondents no.3 & 4 to comply with the direction of the respondent no.2 in the letters dated 14.3.13, 6.5.13 and 2.5.13 as contained in Annexure-10 series, be issued.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.4, i.e. the Chief Executive Officer, Kanti Nagar



Panchayat, Muzaffarpur submits by referring to the counter affidavit, filed on behalf of the respondent no.04 that though the Kanti Nagar Panchayat, Muzaffarpur had entered into an agreement with the petitioners, dated 13.10.2012, however, no training of computer software was ever imparted by the petitioners and in fact the Power Steering Committee of the Kanti Nagar Panchayat, Muzaffarpur had cancelled the agreement dated 13.10.2012, in its meeting held on 23.12.2013, since the Jan Kalyan Samiti failed to impart training of computer to any candidate in Kanti Nagar Panchayat. It is further submitted that the petitioner no.1 i.e. the Jan Kalyan Samiti had also engaged in several irregularities and moreover, it had not imparted any training to any candidate, during the last 10-15 years in the respective wards, hence the claim of the petitioners is unfounded and the present writ petition is fit to be dismissed.

3. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, though this Court finds that prima facie, the present writ petition is not only devoid of any merit but is also not maintainable inasmuch as disputed question of facts cannot be adjudicated in a writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, nonetheless, I deem it fit and proper to



grant liberty to the petitioners to avail such other alternative remedies, as are available under the law, including that of approaching the learned Civil Court of competent jurisdiction for redressal of their subsisting grievances, if any.

4. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Saurav/-

U			
---	--	--	--

