

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Letters Patent Appeal No.1155 of 2014
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2588 of 2012**

=====

Narendra Kumar Jha Son of Shri Vinodanand Jha, Resident of Village and P.O. Bathnaha, P.S. Forbisganj, District - Araria

.... Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Araria
5. The District Teacher's Employment Appellate Authority, Araria through its Members
6. The Member, District Teacher's Employment Appellate Authority, Araria
7. The District Superintendent of Education - cum - District Programme Officer, Araria
8. The Block Development Officer, Block - Farbisganj, District - Araria
9. The Block Education Extension Officer, Block - Farbisganj, District - Araria
10. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj - Amauna, Block - Farbisganj, District - Araria
11. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj - Amauna, Block - Farbisganj, District - Araria
12. Amarnath Keshri Son of Sri Shatrughan Prasad Keshari Resident of Mohalla - Kothihat Chauk, Ward No.3, Farbishganj, P.S. Farbishganj, District - Araria

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate
Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent State: Mr. Arun Kumar, AC to GP-1
For the Respondent No.12 : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Singh, Senior Advocate
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Singh, Advocate
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
Mr. Rishi Roy, Advocate
Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

Date: 05-05-2017

It seems wisdom seems to have prevailed upon the
appellant because the Court after going through the findings recorded



by the learned single Judge was inclined not to interfere with the final finding given by the learned single Judge with regard to the role played by the appellant and his conduct of using forged and fabricated document coupled with suppression of facts to impose suitable cost upon him, which the learned single Judge had not done out of sheer magnanimity.

The facts being what they are, the appellant cannot be allowed to go scot-free. However, as a strategy now, the counsel for the appellant wants to withdraw the appeal and not precipitate the issue beyond a point.

Appeal is dismissed as not pressed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

(Nilu Agrawal, J)

Pawan/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	06.05.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

