

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3678 of 2026

=====

Amit Kumar Son of Santosh Kumar Jha, Resident of Rasulpur Saiyad Salim,
Police Station-Ahiyapur, District-Muzaffarpur, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Rural Development Deptt., Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Manrega, Rural Development Deptt., Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate cum Upper District Programm Co-Ordinator, Manrega, Madhubani.
5. The District Magistrate cum District Programme Co-Ordinator, Manrega, Darbhanga.
6. The D.D.C. cum Dy District Program Co-Ordinator Manrega, Madhubani.
7. The D.D.C. cum Dy District Program Co-Ordinator Manrega, Darbhanga.
8. The District Program Officer, Manrega, Madhubani.
9. The District Program Officer, Manrega, Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arvind Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Navnit Kumar, AC to GP-18

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 17-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing/setting aside Memo No. 34/D.R. dated 06.01.2026 issued by respondent No. 4, the District Magistrate-cum-District Programme Co-ordinator, MNREGA, Darbhanga, whereby and whereunder an ex parte order has been passed without following due procedure and without affording any opportunity of hearing



to the petitioner, and for reinstatement of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, at the time of passing the impugned order, there has been a gross violation of the principles of natural justice. It is, therefore, submitted that immediate interference by this Court is warranted.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that the original authority under the MNREGA Scheme is the Deputy Development Commissioner (DDC), who has taken action upon receiving information that the petitioner had entered into the system by virtue of a forged and fabricated B.Tech. (Civil) degree. It is further submitted that the impugned order categorically mentions that the original authority had sought an explanation from the petitioner, but no explanation was submitted. The appellate authority had also directed the petitioner to file an explanation / show cause; however, no show cause was filed. For this reason, both the original authority and the appellate authority decided to terminate the petitioner.

5. In the writ petition, there is no pleading to the effect that the petitioner's certificate is genuine, nor has any document been produced in support thereof. As such, it transpires to this Court that the defence which the petitioner



ought to have taken has not been taken.

6. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the present writ petition. Accordingly, it is dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

