

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8760 of 2018

=====

Sabitri Devi, W/o Late Jay Narayan Paswan, Resident of village- Saharbanni,
P.S. Alauli, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate Khagaria.
3. The District Panchayat Officer, Khagaria.
4. The Block Development Officer, Parbatta, District- Khagaria.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Abhoy Kumar Kashyap, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	None

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-06-2024

Learned counsel for the petitioner is present, however,

none appears on behalf of the State.

2. After argument advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, it transpires to this Court that the petitioner has earlier moved before this Court by filing CWJC No. 3325 of 2004 which was disposed of vide order dated 14.09.2005 wherein the following order has been passed :-

“The petitioner is an employee of the Government of Bihar. He was suspended on 15.01.1991. His suspension was revoked on 25.04.1992. He was paid subsistence allowance but salary was not paid. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that the petitioner has filed a representation, annexure 3, before the District Magistrate, Khagaria, respondent No.2, but as yet it has not been disposed of. He also says that the writ petition be disposed of directing to dispose of the representation.

In that view of the matter, the writ



petition is disposed of directing the respondent no.2 to dispose of the representation of the petitioner, annexure 3, if not disposed of as yet by a reasoned order in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.”

3. Thereafter, the petitioner has filed his representation, but no decision has been taken on his representation. Therefore, he has filed the present writ petition.

4. After hearing the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner, it transpires to this Court that the petitioner has moved before this Court after the lapse of about 13 years. In view of this Court, the petitioner ought to file MJC, but instead of filing MJC, the reason best known to him, he has chosen to prefer another writ.

5. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has no case. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	24/06/2024
Transmission Date	NA

