

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.7643 of 2025**

Kavita Kumari, aged about 25 years, W/o- Pawan Kumar Yadav, R/o - Village - Babupur, P.O. - Jamuniya, P.S. - Mohanpur, Jamuniya, Deoghar, Jharkhand.

..... Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Jharkhand, through the Chief Secretary, Government of Jharkhand having its office at Project Bhawan, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, District -Ranchi.
2. DC (Deputy Commissioner), Deoghar, having its office at Deoghar, P.O.- GPO, P.S.- Sadar, District-Deoghar, Jharkhand.
3. DDC (Deputy Development commissioner), Deoghar, having its office at Vikas Bhawan, Samaharanalay Parisar, Deoghar, P.O. G.P.O., P.S.- Sadar, District- Deoghar, Jharkhand.
4. DSWO (District Social Welfare Officer), Deoghar having its office at Deoghar, P.O.-G.P.O., P.S.- Sadar, District- Deoghar.
5. CDPO (Child Development Project Officer), Mohanpur having its office at Mohanpur, P.O.- & P.S.- Mohanpur, District- Deoghar
6. Puja Kumari, W/o- Shiromani Prasad Yadav, R/o- Village- Pipra, P.O.- & P.S.- Mohanpur, District-Deoghar.

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vishal Kr. Trivedi, Advocate

For the Resp.-State : Mr. Kumar Pawan, A.C to SC (Mines)-III

03/Dated: 20th January, 2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs :-

“(a) for issuance of an appropriate Writ in the Nature of Certiorari or any other Writ(s), Order(s) or Direction(s) for quashing of the order as contained in Memo No. 331/DSW, Deoghar dated 21.02.2025 (Annexure-19) whereby and where under the District Commissioner has rejected the Petition of the Petitioner filed by her husband deciding on limited grounds rather than holding a proper enquiry into

the matter and without going into the disputed facts which were raised with evidences before him.

(b) for issuance of an appropriate Writ specifically in the nature of Mandamus or any other Writ(s), Order(s), Direction(s) commanding upon the Respondent No. 2 to hold a proper enquiry and pass a proper detailed order with respect to all the points of dispute which have been raised by the Petitioner or her husband with respect to the appointment and forged documents used for appointment of private Respondent No.6.”

2. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition with a liberty to work out his remedy in accordance with law.
3. Learned counsel for the State has raised no objection.
4. Permission is accorded.
5. With the aforesaid liberty, the present writ petition is, hereby, disposed of.
6. Pending interlocutory application, if any, stands disposed of.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

20th January, 2026
Ravi-Chandan/-
Uploaded on 21.01.2026