

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3019 of 2014

=====

Mukesh Kumar Son Of Jay Prakash Ojha Resident Of Village Sarottar, P.S. Keshariya, District- East Champaran

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Cum Commissioner, Human Resources Department, New Secretariat, Patna
2. The Deputy Secretary, Human Resources Department, New Secretariat, Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari
4. The District Programme Officer, East Champaran
5. The District Education Officer, East Champaran
6. The Block Education Officer, Sangrampur, East Champaran (Motihari)
7. The Panchayat Secretary, Bhethwalia Panchayat, P.S. Sangrampur, District- East Champaran
8. The Mukhiya Phulmati Devi, Bhothwalia Panchayat Block Sangrampur, Ps.Sangrampur, District- East Champaran
9. Md. Ajam Emam, Teacher Dushadh Toli Bhathwalia Panchayat New Primary School, Ward No.14 Block Sangrampur, Distt. East Champaran
10. Apda Pravin, Teacher New Primary School Dushadh Toli Ward No. 14 Panchayat Bhathwalia, Sangrampur, Distt. Champaran
11. Shambhu Kumar Mandal Son of Saurug Mandal R/O Village Khawanpur Ps Pirpanti District Bhagalpur
12. Abha Kumar (Teacher) New Primary School Narbala Dih Panchayat Bhathwalia Sangrampur, Dariyabar East Champaran
13. Member, District Teacher Appellate Tribunal, East Champaran (Motihari)

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ashok Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. AC to AAG-15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 18-11-2016

The entire dispute with regard to non-selection and appointment of the petitioner as a Panchayat Teacher now becomes academic in view of the fact that no appointment on the post of Panchayat Teacher can now be made contrary to the provisions, rules and the eligibility laid down therein. All these appointments relate to

the year 2008.

Even if the submission of the counsel for the petitioner that the Tribunal had erred in reaching the conclusion for the non-participation of the petitioner in the counselling is accepted for the argument sake, the appointment can only be made on the basis of eligibility which is in vogue now.

No relief, therefore, can be granted to the petitioner in the changed circumstances.

Writ is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

Pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	18.11.2016
Transmission Date	N/A