

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6028 of 2025

Archana Kumari W/o Krishndev Ray, R/o Village-Dharhara, P.S.-Dharhara,
District-Munger, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Bihar Rural Livelihood Promotion Society (JIVIKA) through its Chief Executive Officer, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Munger.
4. The District Magistrate, Munger.
5. The District Project Manager, JIVIKA, Begusarai.
6. The District Project Manager, Bihar Rural Livelihood Promotion Society, Munger.
7. The Block Project Manager, Bihar Rural Livelihood Promotion Society, Dharhara, Munger.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prem Chand Yadav, Advocate
For Respondent Nos.1, 3 and 4: Mr. Rakesh Prabhat, AC to SC-21
For Respondent Nos.2, 5, 6 & : Mr. Abhinav Shrivastava, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Akshat Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 13-03-2026

Ref: I.A. No.1 of 2025

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner, learned
Senior Counsel for the Bihar Rural Livelihood Promotion
Society and learned Counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for issuance
of writ of mandamus directing the concerned respondents to
reinstate the petitioner after setting aside the order dated
18.12.2024 passed by the Block Project Manager (JIVIKA),



Dharhara, Munger vide letter No.BRLPS/ NRLM / BPIU / DHR /68/2024-25 dated 18.12.2024 and for further direction to the respondents to reinstate the petitioner in her post as MBK with all consequential benefits including back wages.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has filed Interlocutory Application No.1 of 2025 for adding the further relief submitting that during pendency of the writ petition fresh person has been appointed on the said post by virtue of fresh advertisement.

4. But from the record, it transpires that in the I.A. the petitioner has demanded relief against Sujit Kumar S/o. Sri Bachchu Tanti showing him as respondent No.8; whereas in the writ petition there is no such respondent No.8 in the writ petition. Technically speaking that petitioner by virtue of I.A. has demanded relief against a person who is not party to the writ petition.

5. In this view of the matter, such interlocutory application cannot be allowed. Therefore, I.A. No.1 of 2025 is hereby rejected.

Ref: CWJC No.6028 of 2025

6. It transpires to this Court that writ petition was filed for reinstatement of the petitioner, but by the pleadings of the



I.A. it becomes crystal clear that for the post, petitioner wants his reinstatement after removing a new person, who has been appointed at his place, but is not a party in the writ petition.

7. In this view of the matter, it transpires to this Court that the writ petition has become infructuous. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed off with liberty granted to the petitioner to take appropriate remedy before appropriate forum.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

U			
---	--	--	--

