

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17813 of 2025

=====

Annu Kumari alias Annu Devi Daughter of Amlesh Kumar alias Amlesh Sharma, Wife of Pankaj Kumar, permanent resident of Village-Lalachak, Post Office-Tejbigaha, Police Station-Kako, District-Jahanabad (Bihar), at present residing at Uppar Pochra, Barkakana, Ramgarh, Jharkhand.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Union of India through Chairman Railways Board, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager (Personnel), East Central Railways, Danapur Division, Zonal Office, Hajipur, Bihar.
3. The General Manager (Vigilance), East Central Railways, Danapur Division, Zonal Office, Hajipur, Bihar.
4. The Divisional Railways Manager, Danapur Division, Danapur, Bihar.
5. The Central Vigilance Officer, East Central Railways, Zonal Office, Hajipur, Bihar.
6. The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer, East Central Railways, Dhanbad, Jharkhand.
7. Sribhay Sharma, Son of Late Chando Singh, resident of at Uppar Pochra, Barkakana, Ramgarh, Jharkhand, at present posted as Senior Technician Welding, Patratu, Jharkhand, East Central Railways, regional zone, Hajipur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Aklavya Chandan Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Additional Solicitor General
		Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. This writ petition has been filed challenging the appointment of Respondent No. 7/ Senior Technician Welding, in the Railway Department on compassionate ground on account of father of the respondent No. 7, namely, Talkeshwar Sharma alias T.K. Sharma having died-in-harness.

3. The petitioner is the daughter-in-law of the respondent No. 7.

4. The ground for challenging the appointment of the



respondent No. 7 is stated to be the fraud played by the respondent No. 7 in the process of appointment by submitting forged and fabricated documents.

5. The petitioner, however, is not making any claim for her appointment to the post where the respondent No. 7 has been appointed by the Railway Department.

6. In view of the above, it appears that the petitioner has not filed this writ petition for enforcement of her either fundamental or legal rights.

7. The grievance of the petitioner is limited to the fraud alleged to have been played by respondent No. 7 in his appointment by submitting forged and fabricated documents. If that be the case of the petitioner, this writ petition shall stand disposed off with liberty granted to the petitioner to file appropriate complaint or FIR, as the case may be, before the competent authority, if so advised.

8. The writ petition stands disposed off with the above directions.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Siddharth
Sagar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

