

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.436 of 2015

=====

1. Sunita Kumari W/O Rakesh Ranjan, D/O Sri Akhilanand Sharma, R/O Mohalla-
Harnaha Tola Devi Asthan Patna City, P.S.- Khajekala, District- Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through, the Principal Secretary, Educational Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Presiding Officer of District Education Appellate Authority, Patna
4. The Secretary, of the District Education Appellate Authority, Patna
5. The District Education Officer, Patna
6. The Block Development Officer-cum-Executive Officer of Panchayat Samittee
Block- Paliganj, District- Patna
7. The Block Education Officer, Block Paliganj, District- Patna
8. Kumari Prem Lata Rai, D/O Devanand Singh, Resident of Mohalla- 51/12 Fechar
Field Colony, Digha Ghat, Patna, P.S.- Digha, District- Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Singh

For the Respondent/s : DR. A.K. Upadhyaya, SC 20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-04-2015

The original record relating to Appeal Case No.61 of
2014 has been produced by the State counsel.

The reason for giving such a direction was the stand of
the petitioner that an order having civil consequences for her came to
be passed by the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority,
Patna without any notice or without impleadment in the said
proceeding. The above fact seems to be evident from the original
record. That is good enough ground, therefore, to set aside the
impugned order dated 17.11.2014 passed in Appeal Case No.61 of

2014. The impugned order is set aside. Matter is remanded back to the authority with a direction upon the private respondent that she will implead the petitioner as a party to the said dispute. The Presiding Officer thereafter shall hear one and all, including the present petitioner and decide the matter afresh.

The original record is returned to the State counsel. The Court chose not to issue notice to the private respondent looking at the nature of the order passed above.

Writ is allowed in terms of above.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

sk

U			
---	--	--	--