

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.272 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 549 of 2013

=====

Dharam Nath Rai, son of Shyamji Rai, resident of Village- Ghoraihiya,
Police Station- Sri Nagar, Pujahan Patirwa, District- West Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Education Officer, West Champaran
3. The District Programme Officer, West Champran
4. The Block Development officer, Bairiya, West Champaran
5. The Secretary, Panchyat Employment Unit, Gram Panchayat Raj, Siswan
Saraiya, Police Station-Bairiya, District- West Champaran

.... Respondent/s

=====

with
Civil Review No.286 of 2014
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3263 of 2013

=====

Kumari Seema Gupta wife of Amarnath Prasad, resident of Village -
Jagirahan, Police Station, - Bairiya , District- West Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Education Officer, West Champaran
3. The Block Development Officer, Bairiya, West Champaran
4. The Secretary, Panchyat Employment Unit, Gram Panchayat Raj, Siswan,
Saraiya, Police Station- Bairiya, District- West Champaran.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance:
(In C. REV. No.272 of 2014)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhakar Tekriwal, Advocate
Mr. Manish Kumar -3
For the State: Mr. Rana B.N. Singh, AC to GA-10
(In C. REV. No.286 of 2014)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manish Kumar -3, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Kumar Pankaj, AC to SC-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 14-09-2016

Heard Mr. Prabhakar Tekriwal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Rana Bhupendra Narayan Singh, Assisting Counsel to G.A.-10 for the State.

The two applications have been filed praying for review of the judgment and order passed by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Mihir Kumar Jha (as his Lordship then was) in CWJC No. 549 of 2013 and CWJC No.3263 of 2013, copies of which is impugned at Annexure-1 to the respective writ petitions and whereby the writ petitions filed by the two review petitioners herein have been dismissed on grounds that since the petitioners did not possess the requisite qualification hence the termination of their services from the post of Panchayat Teacher suffered no infirmity. The services of the two petitioners who were holding the post of Panchayat Teacher was terminated on grounds that they have not obtained degree of B.Ed. qualification from a recognized institution. The writ court thus in consideration of the materials on record has upheld the termination by holding that these petitioners did not possess the requisite educational qualification. Although the petitioners did question the judgment and order of the Bench in appeal arising from L.P.A. No. 674 of 2014 respectively but on the matter being taken up, these petitioners withdrew the appeals to file a review application.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and I have perused the records. It is in consideration of the materials on record that the B.Ed. qualification obtained by the petitioners from the institution concerned was not upheld by the Court taking note of the stand of the respondents. The petitioners have not brought anything on record which would reflect whether the opinion so expressed by the Court in consideration of the materials on record suffered from any error on record.

In that view of the matter, the grounds raised for a review of the judgment and order passed by the Bench requires no interference and the two review applications are accordingly dismissed.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--