

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 4678 of 2011

=====

Dhiraj Kumar S/o Sri Kishori Singh, R/o Village Sanda , P.S. Tekari, Distt. Gaya.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary , Human Resource Development, Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna
2. The Director Primary Education, Department, of H.R.D. New Secretariate, Patna
3. The Joint Secretary, Department, of Art, Culture and Youth Department, Govt. of Bihar.
4. The District Superintendent of Education, Banka
5. The District Teacher Appointment Appellate Tribunal through its Member, Banka
6. The Block Development Officer, Barahat Block Barahat, Distt. Banka
7. The Block Education Extension Officer, Barahat Block, Distt. Banka

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Navin Prasad Slingsh

For the Respondent/s : AC to Addl. Advocate General 6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 24-11-2015 Heard Sri Navin Prasad Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.C. to Addl. Advocate General – 6.

The petitioner, invoking writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, has prayed for quashing of an order contained in Memo No. AP/466 dated 18-08-2009 passed by the District Teacher Appointment Appellate Tribunal, Banka in Case no. 297 of 2009 (Annexure – 9 to the writ petition). By the said order, the appeal preferred by the petitioner has been rejected.

On perusal of the impugned order, it is evident that the petitioner had not produced certain documents, particularly; certificate in respect of Intermediate examination.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that intermediate pass was not condition precedent for such appointment. By referring to Rule 8 of the Bihar Panchayat Primary Teacher (Employment & Service Conditions) Rule, 2006, he submits that there is exception to that and as such, the order impugned is liable to be set aside.

In the writ petition, the petitioner has not bothered to bring on record the advertisement to show what was the basic criteria.

In view of the fact that the petitioner had not produced certain relevant document, I do not find any error in the impugned order.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--