

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9673 of 2025

-
-
1. Fulmati Devi, w/o Birbal Ram, Resident of Village-Surwal, P.S.-Zeradei, District-Siwan.
 2. Punita Devi, W/o Sri Vishwakarma Ram, Resident of Village-Surwal, P.S.-Zeradei, District-Siwan.
 3. Binod Baitha, S/o Rekha Baitha, Resident of Village and P.O. and P.S.-Zeradei, District-Siwan.
 4. Hari Shankar Singh, S/o Uma Shankar Singh, Resident of Village-Surwal, P.S.-Zeradei, District-Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Siwan.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Siwan.
5. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Siwan.
6. The Block Development Officer, Ziradei, Siwan.
7. Block Panchayati Raj Officer, Ziradei.
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Ziradei, Siwan.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Additional Advocate General (7)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 26-06-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners before this Court are ‘Swakshata Karmi’, who were duly engaged under the scheme of ‘Swakshta Abhiyan’ in pursuant to the letter No. 36’C’ dated 20.12.2021.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioners contended that after the engagement in terms with the afore-noted letters, the



petitioners have been charging their duty as Swakshata Karmi without any interruption and to the utmost satisfaction of the authorities concerned. However, all on a sudden, the Supervisor of the scheme disallowed the petitioner to discharge their duty, without there being any rhymes and reason.

4. It is the specific contention of the petitioners that persons/Swakshata Karmi of their choices have been allowed to discharge their duty, but discrimination has been caused and the petitioners have been restrained to discharge their duty. Till date, neither the services of the petitioners have been dispensed with nor there is any adverse order regarding closure of the Scheme. Moreover, the petitioners have also been deprived from remuneration for certain period, for which they have also represented before the Block Development Officer, Ziradei, Siwan; but, till date, no action has been taken.

5. Learned Advocate for the State submits that since the Block Development Officer is the competent authority and the representation is already pending, he shall consider the claim of the petitioners.

6. Having considered the submissions set forth, this Court deems it fit and proper to direct the Block Development Officer to take up the representation of the petitioners and



resolve the dispute, in the light of terms of their engagement
viz-a-viz the object of the Scheme.

7. It is also expected that the respondent no. 6 shall
also consider the claim of the petitioners for remuneration and
ensure payment thereof, if found admissible, preferably within a
period of eight weeks’ from the date of receipt/production of a
copy of this order.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

