

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12970 of 2014

=====

Laxman Ram Son of Bholi Ram, resident of village- Sataha Mangurahan, P.S.-
Paharpur, District- East Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Department of Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.
4. The District Superintendent of Education, East Champaran, Motihari.
5. The Superintendent of Police, East Champaran, Motihari.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Areraj, District- East Champaran.
7. The Block Development Officer, Paharpur, District- East Champaran.
8. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Areraj, District- East Champaran.
9. The Officer-in-Charge, Paharpur, Police Station- Paharpur, District- East Champaran.
10. Sahdeo Ram Son of not known, Head Master, Upgraded (Utkramik) Rajkiya Madhya Vidyalaya, Sataha, District- East Champaran.
11. Birendra Prasad, Son of not known, Assistant Teacher, Rajkiya Utkramik Madhya Vidyalaya, Paharpur, East Champaran.
12. Brajesh Kumar, Son of not known, Assistant Teacher, Rajkiya Utkramik Madhya Vidyalaya, Paharpur, East Champaran.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Binay Kumar Pandey, A.C. to G.A. 2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 07-02-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The present writ application has been filed for a
direction to the State authorities to initiate enquiry with regard to
misappropriation of Government fund of Vidyalaya Shiksha Samiti,
Utkramik Madhya Vidyalaya, Sataha in the District of East
Champaran.



Learned counsel for the State raised a preliminary objection and submitted that the locus of the petitioner is suspect since he has not stated anything about himself and his connection with the said school. He submitted that in fact, the petitioner has relied upon a compliant made by the one Mukhdeo Yadav. He submitted that the petitioner cannot be allowed to pursue the case of another person and the present appears to be litigation for the purposes of settling personal score.

Having considered the matter, the Court finds substance in the objection raised by learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner not having disclosed about his background or vocation and further about his source of information relating to any irregularity, cannot be allowed the indulgence to raise the matter straight away before the High Court at the first instance. As a citizen of India, he has all the rights available to him to move before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law, for the grievance which has been raised in the present writ application.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	

