

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18193 of 2015**

=====

The Managing Committee of Sri Amrendra Mishra Prathmik Madhya Sah-Uachch- Vidyalay, Husainabad, Raghapur, Supaul through its Secretary Surat Lal Mandal Son of Sri Kishan Mandal, Resident of Village Husainabad, Police Station Raghapur, District Supaul.

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Vikas Bhawan, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Vikas Bhawan, Patna
3. The Special Director, Secondary Education (Sanskrit), Government of Bihar, Human Resources Development Department, Vikas Bhawan, Patna.
4. The Director, Secondary Education, Human Resources Development Department, Vikas Bhawan, Patna.
5. The Chairman Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, East Boring Canal Road, Patna.
6. The Secretary, Bihar Sanskrit Siksha Board, East Boring Canal Road, Patna.

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

|                    |   |                                 |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner | : | Mr. Viveka Nand Singh, Advocate |
| For the State      | : | A.C. to A.A.G.10                |
| For B.S.S.B.       | : | Mr. S.S. Sundaram, Advocate     |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**  
**Date: 26-07-2016**

The Court directed the Director, Secondary Education (Sanskrit), Government of Bihar to file an affidavit in specifics as to what was lacking or the reason for rejection of the claim of the petitioner for permanent recognition since the order of rejection was cryptic.

2. An affidavit has been filed wherein it has been stated that after due inspection and verification of the institution in question, a conditional recommendation had been made in favour of the school whose name figures at serial no.134 of Annexure-A.

3. Since the recommendation of the Sanskrit Shiksha

Board was conditional, it is obvious that the school did not fulfill all the requirements with regard to infrastructure etc. which is warranted in terms of the provision as laid down in the 1993 Rules. That was the sole reason why the recognition not only to this institution but to many other institutions came to be rejected.

4. If this be so, then if the petitioner has removed the shortcomings and he is otherwise ready for a fresh inspection and fulfills the requirements in terms of the 1993 Rules, he can always demand a fresh inspection and based on the said inspection recommendation of the Sanskrit Shiksha Board can be made to the petitioner afresh for consideration.

5. So far as the present writ application is concerned, no relief can be extended to the petitioner in the above stated background and decision.

6. Writ application stands disposed of in terms of the above observation.

**(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J.)**

SanjayKumar/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          |            |
| Uploading Date    | 27.07.2016 |
| Transmission Date |            |