

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Letters Patent Appeal No.1415 of 2013  
IN  
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 6622 of 2010**

=====

Madhu Kumari W/O Niranjan Kumar Resident Of Village- Sithaura, P.S Silao,  
District- Nalanda (Bihar)

.... .... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Secretary, Primary Secondary and Adult Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna
3. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
5. District Teacher's Appointment Appellate Authority, Biharsharif, Nalanda.
6. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Magadh Range, Patna.
7. The District Superintendent of Education, Nalanda.
8. The Area Education Officer, Nalanda.
9. The Block Education Extension Officer, Silao, District- Nalanda.
10. The Mukhiya, Grampanchayat Barakar, Block- Silao, P.S- Silao District- Nalanda.
11. The Vice Mukhiya, Grampanchayat Barakar P.S- Silao, District- Nalanda.
12. Smt. Rambha Kumari, Presently Posted As Shiksha Mitra/ Panchayat Teacher, Primary School, Sithaura, Grampanchayat- B Arakar, P.S- Silao, District- Nalanda.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Amerendra Kumar, AC to AAG-15

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**And**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

**Date: 04-08-2017**

None appears for the appellant. None had appeared on last two dates also. Mr. Amrendra Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents is present.

Challenging the orders passed by the District



Teacher Employment Authority, Bihar Sharif in Case No. 1406 of 2009, rejecting the prayer made by the appellant, permitting her to continue as Panchayat Shiksha Mitra, the writ petition in question was filed.

Learned Writ Court found that the primary reason why the Tribunal rejected the prayer of the appellant was that the appellant's contract appointment was up to the year 2004 and thereafter there was no renewal of the same. Taking note of various aspects of the matter so also the certificates issued to the appellant, learned Writ Court has found that there being no renewal of the contract and after 01.07.2006 the post itself having been abolished, no interference can be made. We find no error in the order passed by the learned Writ Court warranting any reconsideration.

Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed.

**(Rajendra Menon, CJ)**

**(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)**

Shageer/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | NA         |
| Uploading Date    | 08/08/2017 |
| Transmission Date | NA         |

