

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.1565 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14887 of 2011

=====

Usha Kumari D/o Sri Satrudhan Praasad, W/o Sri Naresh Prasad, resident of
Village- Sakarpura, P.O. Bhobhi, P.S. Nagarnausa, District- Nalanda.

... .. Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Collector, Nalanda at Biharsarif.
3. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
4. The District Education Officer, Nalanda at Biharsarif.
5. The Assistant District Education Officer, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
6. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Nalanda at Biharsarif.
7. The Prakahad Pramukh Nagarnausa Block, Nagarnausa, Nalanda.
8. The Block Development officer, Nagarnausa, District- Nalanda.
9. The Block Education Extension Officer, Nagarnausa Block, Nagarnausa,
Districti- Nalanda.
10. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Kachhiyawan, P.S. Nagarnausa, District-
Nalanda.
11. Sri Indeadeo Pandit, the then Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Kacchiyawan, P.S.
Nagarnausa, District Nalanda.
12. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Kacchiyawan, P.S. Nagarnausa,
District- Nalanda.
13. Sri Sharwan Kumar Singh, S/o Not known, the Panchayat Secretary, Gram
Panchayat Kacchiyawan, Nagarnausa, District- Nalanda.
14. The District Teacher's Employment Appellate Tribunal, Nalanda, Biharsharif,
through its member.
15. Kumari Rimjhim Sinha D/o Sri Shivjee Paswan, resident of Village- Baldha,
P.O. Damodarpur, Baldha, P.S. Nagarnausa, District- Nalanda, at present
working as Panchayat Teacher, Primary School Dariyapur, Kacchiyawan, P.S.
Nagarnausa, District- Nalanda.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Umesh Kumar Verma
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad Singh, Senior Advocate Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

8 18-12-2017 Though we agree with the submission of the learned
counsel for the appellant that the reason for dismissal of the writ



application by the learned single Judge was not provided and the writ application was dismissed in limine. However, on deeper examination of the matter, it is apparent that the appellant has no case for any indulgence. The Tribunal has not found any material or evidence to show that she participated or she deliberately was kept out of the zone of consideration in the counselling and now she has also found employment as a regular teacher.

In view of the same, the Court is not inclined to interfere with the order impugned of the learned single Judge.

Appeal is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Pawan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

