Jharkhand High Court

Smt. Surji Paharin & Ors vs State Of Jharkhand & Ors on 10 October, 2011

In the High Court of Jharkhand at Ranchi

W.P.(S) No.2971 of 2011

1. Smt. Surji Paharin

2. Sumia Soren

3. Pansuri Hembrum..... Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Jharkhand and others......Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.R.PRASAD

For the Petitioners : Mr.Shresth Gautam

For the State : G.P.I

6/ 10.10.11

. Since similarly situated other matter has been disposed of vide order dated 16th September, 2011, this writ application was heard and is being disposed of.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that all the three petitioners working as Angan Bari Sevika in different Angan Bari Centers, namely, Anlagachi, Bhagwanpur and Vetatola were allegedly found absent when the then Deputy Commissioner made inspection of the aforesaid Angan Bari Centers and hence, their services were terminated vide order as contained in memo no.45 dated 17.2.2011 issued by the Child Development Programme Officer, Maheshpur. The said order has been sought tobe quashed.

It was submitted that without giving any opportunity to the petitioners to have their say in the matter, services of the petitioners have been terminated and hence, it is gross violation of the principle of natural justice and taking into account this aspect of the matter, other persons whose services were terminated in similar circumstances by the same impugned order has been set aside by this Court in W.P.(S) No.2951 of 2011.

Having heard learned counsel appearing for the parties, it does appear that the petitioners services have been terminated without giving any opportunity to them to have their say in the matter and hence, on this count alone, the impugned order under which services of the petitioners have been terminated suffers from illegality and hence, the said order as contained in memo no.45 dated 17.2.2011 is hereby quashed.

However, the authority would be at liberty to proceed in the matter in accordance with law, if he chooses to do so.

1

Accordingly, this writ application is allowed.

(R. R. Prasad, J.) N.D.