

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2361 of 2023

-
-
1. Gunjan Kumari Wife of Sri Sintu Kumar Vill.- Bhadly, W.No.- 17, P.O.- Borna, P.S.- Maheshkhut, Dist.- Khagaria.
 2. July Yadav, Wife of Mukesh Yadav W.No.- 4, Vill.- Bhiktiya, P.S.- Maheshkhut, P.O.- Mahesh Kut, Dist.- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principle Secretary, Department of Local Self Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Director Gram Panchyat, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. District Magistrate, Khagaria.
4. Dy. Dev. Commissioner, Munger.
5. District Panchyat Raj Officer, Khagaria.
6. Block Panchyat Raj Officer, Khagaria.
7. Block Development Officer, Gogri, Khagaria.
8. Md. Saukat Alam, Son of Late Md. Jaliluddin Vill.- Jhikia, W. No.- 9, P.O. and P.S.- Mahesh Khut, Dist.- Khagaria.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mrs.Indira Kumari, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Kameshwar Pd. Gupta (Gp10)
		Mrs. Deepanjali Gupta, AC to GP-10

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 25-02-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petition has been filed for the following reliefs:-

“ 01. That this writ is directed against the order dated-01.12.2022 passed by Block Panchyat Raj Officer, Khagaria, the Respondent No. 6 to appoint Md. Saukat Alam, the Respondent No. 8 appointing him Dy. Mukhia of Gram Panchyat, Jhiktia, who had



lost his post being absconder as prescribed under section 18(5) of the Gram Panchyat Raj Act so he was no more a Dy. Mukhia So the Gram Shabha, vide their resolution appointed the petitioner No. 1 Gunjan Kumari, who started to work as Dy Mukhia, of Panchyat but just after two days of her working Dy Mukhia the Respondent no. 8 Saukat appeared after being absconding for 6 months + 7 days, which is illegal and wrong. When the petitioner was working as Dy. Mukhia and was not removed by Gram Panchyat or the re-instalment of Respondent No.8 was neither approved by Gram Shabha or any higher Authority.” .

3. In this case on 10.09.2024, two weeks peremptory time was granted to the petitioner to remove the defect(s).

4. As it was a peremptory order and was not complied with, it stands dismissed on 24.09.2024.

5. Perused the file, consigned.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

