

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.924 of 2015

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 4111 of 2015

=====

Md. Mashroob Kausar, son of Md. Quasim, resident of village- Siktihar, Post Office- Sontha, Police Station- Bahadurganj, District- Kishanganj.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary Education, Secretariat Building, Patna-1.
2. The District Education Officer, Kishanganj.
3. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Raj Jhiljhili, Post Office and Police Station- Bahadurganj, District- Kishanganj.
4. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Jhiljhili, Post Office and Police station- Bahadurganj, District- Kishanganj.
5. The Block Education Officer, Bahadurganj, Post Office and Police Station- Bahadurganj, District- Kishanganj.
6. The District Teacher's Employment Appellate Authority, Kishanganj, Post Office & Police and District- Kishanganj.
7. Tanzeem Raza, son of Siddique Alam, Assistant Teacher, Bihar Education Project Primary School, Bentbari No. 7 in resident of village Siktihar, Post Office- Sontha, Police Station Bahadurganj, District- Kishanganj.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Najmul Hoda, Advocate

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 11-08-2017

Challenge in this appeal is made to an order dated 26.03.2015 passed by a learned Single Bench of this Court in CWJC No.4111 of 2015 under Clause 10 of the Letters Patent.

In the matter of appointment to the post of Assistant Teacher, the learned Writ Court found that the appointments were made in the year 2010 and the petitioner approached the Tribunal in the



year 2014 as challenge was made after a period of four years and there has been no justifiable reason for interference, the writ petition has been dismissed. In doing so, we are of the considered view that the learned Writ Court has not committed any error which warrants consideration.

That apart, the petitioner did not participate in the process of counselling also. Contention of the petitioner that she had not been noticed for counselling cannot be accepted for the simple reason that counselling date was informed to the candidates by issuing call letters and they were directed to appear for counselling. That being the position, we find no reason to make any indulgence into the matter. The appeal stands dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Sunil/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	19.08.2017
Transmission Date	

