WEB COPY NOT OFFICIAL

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.357 of 2014
Arising out of
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 18651 of 2012

==========

Manish Kumar Son Of Sri Bindeshwari Yadav Resident Of Village Mangrar, P.S. Lakshmipur, Dist. Jamui

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Human Resource Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. Principal Secretary, Human Resource Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. Director, Primary Education, Human Resource Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. Ld. Member, District Teacher Niyozan Appellate Tribunal, Jamui
5. District Magistrate, Jamui
6. District Program Officer (Establishment), Jamui
7. District Education Officer, Jamui
8. Panchayat Niyozan Unit, Village Panchayat Raj Kakanchour, Through Its Member-Secretary (Panchayat Secretary), P.S.- Lakshmipur, Dist.- Jamui
9. Member Secretary (Panchayat Secretary), Panchayat Niyozan Unit, Village Panchayat Raj Kakanchour, P.S. Lakshmipur, District- Jamui

.... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Appellant/s : Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s :

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH

ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA)
Date: 25-07-2016

The challenge in the present Letters Patent Appeal is to an order passed by the learned Single Bench on 12.08.2013 whereby the writ petition filed by the petitioner for appointment to the post of Panchayat Teacher remained unsuccessful.

Earlier the appellant invoked the jurisdiction of the District Teachers Employment Appellate Tribunal (in short the 'Tribunal'). The Tribunal found that the claim of the appellant falls in the General Category. There were two posts in General Category against which one Arvind Kumar Yadav having merit marks 74.18 % and on the second Vijay Kumar Yadav having obtained 75.20% was appointed. Therefore, the Tribunal did not find any merit in the claim of the appellant.

The second grievance of the appellant was forgery in the marks-sheet of the selected candidates. The learned Single Bench has rightly found that the allegations are vague. It is not pointed out that which candidate has committed forgery and what forgery. In fact, it appears to be a case of fishing enquiry. In absence of any specific allegation of forgery, none could be examined and, therefore, the learned Single Bench has rightly dismissed the writ application.

We do not find any error in the order passed by the learned Single Bench which may warrant interference in the present

Letters Patent Appeal.

The Letters Patent Appeal stands dismissed.

(Hemant Gupta, J)

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J)

P. Kumar/Anjani

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	N/A