

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1749 of 2017

Dr. Prabhash Kumar S/o Shri Bhola Prasad Yadav, R/o Village- Lalpatti, P.S.-
Triveniganj, PO- Baghla, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through, the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Secretary, Rural Development Deponent cum Chief Executive Officer, Jeevika, Patna.
4. The State Project Managers and Project Managers, Patna.
5. The District Project Manager, Saharsa.
6. The Block Project Manager, Salkhua, Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Alok Kumar, Advocate Mr. Pranav Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Rajan Prakash, AC to GA-2
For the Resp. No.3	:	Mr. Abhinav Shrivastava, Sr. Advocate Mr. Akshat Kumar, Advocate Mr. Pushkar Bhardwaj, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

5 05-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has filed the instant application for
the following relief :-

*“That is an application on behalf of
petitioner for issuance of a writ of Mandamus
directing the respondents to extend the contract
of services of petitioner as Livelihood specialist
(L.H.S) as the contract of similarly situated
persons have been extended whereas the*



petitioner has been left out arbitrarily and petitioner further prays for issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing of the communication made by letter no. 149 dated 1.8.2016 by which the petitioner has been informed that the contract of service of petitioner is not being extended any further and petitioner further prays for issuance of any other writ/writs order/orders direction/directions which the Hon'ble Court may deem and fit and proper."

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner referring to letter dated 1.8.2016 (Annexure-5) of the District Project Manager, District Project Co-ordination Unit, Saharsa submits that the petitioner is not pressing the relief prayed for in reference to the first part of the letter therein which states that the contract of the petitioner's service is not being extended any further. Learned counsel however submits that the petitioner has not been given the payment for the month of July, 2016 which as per the said letter would be released as per the direction of State Project Manager Unit (SPMU).

4. In response, learned Senior counsel appearing for the respondent no.3 submits that SPMU not having been made party respondent herein, the direction of SPMU which is referred to in the letter dated 1.8.2016 is not known.

5. In view of the above, the instant application is



disposed of directing the petitioner to file a representation before the authority concerned of the SPMU for the grievances of payment for the month of July, 2016.

6. In case such a representation is filed within a period of four weeks, the same shall be decided by the authority concerned within a period of three months from the date of its filing and the admitted amount shall be paid within the aforesaid period.

7. In case the amount sought for is not found payable, a communication in writing giving reasons shall be communicated to the petitioner expeditiously.

8. It is made clear that the Court has not entered into the merits of the case with respect to payment of the amount being claimed for for the month of July, 2016 by the petitioner which is to be decided by the authority concerned.

9. The application stands disposed of.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

avinash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

