

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4349 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2896 of 2014

- =====
1. Meena Devi, Wife of Suraj Narayan Singh, Resident of Village - Sahadatpur, P.S. - Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
 2. Pradeep Singh, Son of Late Ram Lakhan Singh, Resident of Village - Nanhakal, P.S. - Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
 3. Reena Kumari, Wife of Bablu Mishra, Resident of Village - Gurwaliya, P.S. - Bettiah (Muffasil), District - West Champaran
 4. Manju Devi, Wife of Sunil Kumar Rao, Resident of Village - Khairatiya, P.S. - Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
 5. Raj Kumar Rao, Son of Kripa Chandra Rao, Resident of Village - North Nanhakar, P.S. - Yogapatti, District - West Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Sri Amarjeet Sinha, the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Bihar, Patna
2. Sri Lokesh Kumar Verma, the District Magistrate, West Champaran at Bettiah
3. Sri Niteshwar Pathak, the Block Education Extension Officer, Block - Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
4. Sri Ashok Kumar Gupta, the Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Raj Donwar, Block Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
5. Sri Ramesh Thakur, the Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Donwar, Block Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
6. Sri Ashok Rai, the Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj, Siswa Bhumihaar, Block Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
7. Sri Sadhu Sah, the Panchayat Secretary Gram Panchayat Raj, Siswa Bhumihaar, Block Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
8. Sri Sachindra Kumar Pandey, the Mukhiya Ram Panchayat Raj, Fatehpur, Block Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
9. Sri Pramod Mishra, the Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Fatehpur, Block Yogapatti, District - West Champaran
10. Sri Lalan Jha, the District Education Officer, West Champaran, Bettiah
11. Sri Sanjay Chaudhary, the District Programme Officer, West Champaran, Bettiah

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Virendra Kuar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Irshad, A.C. to S.C.-1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

4 16-05-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the



learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

It appears from the show cause filed by opposite parties that the concerned opposite parties have given a due consideration of the order passed by this Court and vide Memo No.3300 dated 09.10.2013 held that the Bhartiya Shiksha Parishad, Uttar Pradesh did not have the authority to issue any educational or training certificate. Bhartiya Shiksha Parishad, Uttar Pradesh is entitled to issue certificates for only Class-X and XII and not otherwise. As such, the certificates produced by the petitioners have not been accepted by the concerned opposite parties. It further appears from the orders under contempt that the case of petitioner no.1, Meena Devi, had been squarely rejected unless and until she satisfies the authority regarding the genuineness of the certificate.

So far as the other petitioner Nos.2 to 5 are concerned, the only direction was to place their cases before the competent committee for appointment on the posts of Prakhanda Teacher.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that their cases have not been considered by the appropriate committee. He thus submits that there has been contempt of the order passed by this Court.



Be that as it may, the matter now requires adjudication, which can be challenged by the petitioners in an appropriate proceeding. The contempt Court cannot look beyond the order passed by the earlier Court. All that it has to do is to give conscious consideration in letter and spirit to the order passed by the Writ Court.

From a perusal of the show cause filed by the opposite parties, it appears that the District Programme Officers, East Champaran, Bettiah as well as the District Education Officer, East Champaran, Bettiah, vide their report dated 23.02.2015, have given a conscious consideration of the matter.

Thus, no case for contempt is made out in the facts and circumstances of the case. The M.J.C. application, thus, stands disposed of.

(Anjana Mishra, J)

PNM

U			
---	--	--	--

