

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.3786 of 2013

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1685 of 2010

=====

Aarti Kumari, Daughter Of Sri Baidya Nath Prasad Singh, Wife Of Umesh Chandra Kumar, Resident Of Village- Agahara, Gram Panchayat- Agahara, Block- Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Primary And Adult Education Department, Government Of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Primary And Adult Education Department, Government Of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Saran Division At Chapra.
5. The District Magistrate, Saran At Chapra, District- Saran At Chapra.
6. The District Superintendent Of Education, Saran At Chapra, District- Saran At Chapra.
7. The Block Development Officer, Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.
8. The Block Education Extension Officer, Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.
9. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj, Agahara, Block- Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.
10. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Agahara, Block- Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.
11. Ravi Ranjan Srivastava, Son Of Sri Janardan Prasad Srivastava, Resident Of Village- Parmanandpur, P.S.- Sonepur, District- Saran At Chapra.
12. Jiut Prasad, Son Of Ambika Rai, Resident Of Village- Jauinia, P.S.- Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.
13. Madhubala Kumari, Wife Of Sri Manoj Thakur, Resident Of Village- Sherpur, P.S. Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.
14. Nilam Devi, Daughter Of Surendra Singh, Resident Of Village- Jauinia, P.S.- Marhaura, District- Saran At Chapra.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. S.B. K. Manglam, Advocate

Ms. Anita Kumari, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, AC to GP 22

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

6 15-09-2017 Even though this application has been filed for restoration
of L.P.A. No.1685 of 2010, on going through the original order



challenged in LPA No.1685 of 2010 and taking note of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the changed circumstances and the subsequent statutory rules that have come into force, no relief can be granted to the petitioner and, therefore, no useful purpose will be served now by restoring LPA No.1685 of 2010 and, hence, it is not appropriate to allow this application.

In view of the above, the application stands dismissed

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Sunil/-

U			
---	--	--	--

