

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4315 of 2016

=====

1. Girja Devi wife of Manoj Kumar Resident of Village - Jagriti Tola, Dumaria
Khurd, P.S. - Parbatta, District - Khagaria.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Munger.
5. The District Education Officer, Khagaria.
6. The Block Education Officer, Parbatta, District Khagaria.
7. The Gram Panchayat, Kabela through the Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Kabela.
8. The Mukhia, Gram Panchayat, Kabela.
9. Shivangi wife of Ravi Prakash @ Sonu Kumar Resident of Village - Dumaria Khurd, P.S. - Parbatta, District - Khagaria.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suryakant Kumar
For the State : Mr. Ravi Ranjan, AC to SC 22
For Respondent no.9 : Mr Ajay Thakur

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 03-08-2016

On 5.7.2016, the Director, Primary Education as well as the District Education Officer appeared in terms of the previous direction. This was necessitated in view of the controversy generated because of tug of war between the petitioner and yet another Panchayat Teacher, namely, respondent no.9, Shivangi. There were allegations of favoritism and nepotism in favour of respondent no.9 by

support being provided by the District Education Officer as well as the District Programme Officer.

Panchayat Teachers are not required to be made incharge of any school, an issue already held and decided by various orders passed by the High Court on similar disputes, which had travelled earlier. There were even directives issued at the level of Director upon all District Education Officers or District Programme Officers (Establishment). Unfortunately, they are followed more in breach.

The present dispute, which is a turf battle between the petitioner and the private respondent no.9, is because of the same reason.

The Court, therefore, directed to conduct an enquiry and submit a report, which has been done in a sealed cover. The sealed cover has been opened by the Court and gone through. The Director, therefore, is directed to take follow up action against all the persons based on the outcome of the enquiry. Whether it is going to be administrative or even criminal justice system is required to be set in motion is for the Director to decide. But the matter should not be allowed to rest after what has glaringly emerged in the enquiry, made by the Director himself.

The writ application stands dismissed. The Director shall make sure that his recommendations and conclusions are taken

to its logical end. The report is placed on record.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

sk

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	04.8.2016
Transmission Date	