

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7865 of 2026

Manju Devi wife of Abodh Mandal, Resident of Herudiara Kali Ashtan, P.O-
Herudiara, P.S- Safiabad, District-Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate Munger, District- Munger
3. The District Project Manager Jeevika, Purabsarai, Munger
4. The Chief executive officer Jeevika, Vidyut Bhawan, Patna
5. The Block project Manager, Jeevika, Jamalpur, Munger
6. The Divisional Commissioner Munger
7. Juli Kumar wife of Sunny Kumar Yadav, Resident of Herudiara, P.S- Safiasarai, District- Munger.
8. Ruby Kumari, W/o Kismat Kumar, vill-Dakra Satkhajuria P.S. and P.O. Safisarai, District-Munger.
9. Bharti Kumari, W/o Sri Devendra Sah, vill-Dakra Satkhajuria P.S. and P.O. Safisarai, District-Munger.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Suman Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vivek Prasad, GP-7
		Mr. Sanjay Kumar, AC to GP-7

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 18-06-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the letter dated 14.09.2025 issued by the Secretary, Jeevika Sankul, Purvi Tola, Farda, Indrukh West, Jamalpur, Munger, whereby her engagement as Community Mobilizer in Panchayat Indrukh West, Jamalpur, Munger has been terminated on the allegation of financial irregularities. Seeking redressal of her grievance,



the petitioner has submitted several representations before the competent authorities, including a representation before the respondent no.4, the Chief Executive Officer, Jeevika, Vidyut Bhawan, Patna, a copy whereof has been brought on record as Annexure-P/7.

3. At the outset, learned Advocate for the State has raised a preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of the present writ petition, having regard to the nature of the post held by the petitioner.

4. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the respective parties and upon perusal of the materials available on record, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition on merits at this stage. However, considering the fact that the petitioner has already approached the respondent no.4, by filing the representation contained in Annexure-P/7, the ends of justice would be served if the said representation is considered and disposed of by the competent authority.

5. Accordingly, respondent no.4, is directed to consider and dispose of the petitioner's representation (Annexure-P/7) by passing a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

6. It is further observed that if the petitioner is



otherwise found entitled to honorarium for the period during which she actually rendered services, the claim relating thereto shall also be examined and an appropriate decision shall be taken in accordance with law.

7. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

