

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1724 of 2015

=====

1. Sunita Kumari, Wife of Pankaj Kumar, resident of village - Madhopur, Police Station - Ghosi in the District of Jehanabad

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate - Cum - Collector, Jehanabad
4. The District Superintendent of Education, Jehanabad
5. The Block Development officer, Makhdumpur
6. The Block Education Extension Officer, Makhdumpur
7. The Gram Panchayat, Jamanganj through its Secretary under Makhdumpur Block in the district of Jehanabad
8. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat, Jamanganj under Makhdumpur Block in the district of Jehanabad
9. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Jamanganj under Makhdumpur Block in the district of Jehanabad
10. Neelam Kumari, wife of Ram Suchit Prasad, resident of village - Mandil, Police Station - Jehanabad in the district of Jehanabad
11. Babita Kumari, wife of Uday Kumar, resident of village - Musauli, Police Station - Hulasganj in the district of Jehanabad
12. Manju Kumari, Wife of Chandra Shekhar Azad, resident of village - Nirpura, Police Station - Makhdumpur in the district of Jehanabad
13. Suresh Prasad, Son of not known to the petitioner, resident of village - Narawat, P.S. Atari in the district of Jehanabad
14. Sanjay Kumar, son of name not known to the petitioner resident of village - Chatar, P.S. Makhdumpur in the district of Jehanabad

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Navin Sharma

For the Respondent/s : Mr. SC17-ARBIND KUMAR NO. II

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-06-2016

The issue raised before the High Court is not required to be gone into at this stage merely because of the previous direction of the High Court, a fresh exercise for selection has been made. If the same

is not palatable to the petitioner, she has remedy under law by approaching the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority. There is no reason for this Court to entertain the writ application directly at this juncture.

Writ application stands disposed of with above observation.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

R.K.Pathak/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	20/06/2016
Transmission Date	