

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.6515 of 2013

=====

Govind Sharan Mishra, Son Of Late Pancham Mishra, Resident Of Village-
Umarpur, P.O. Paiga, Police Station- Bheldi, District- Saran (Chapra).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Shri Amarjeet Sinha, the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government Of Bihar, Patna.
3. Shri Ashok Kumar Chaudhary, The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
4. Shri Vinay Kumar, The District Magistrate, Saran At Chapra.
5. Shri S.M. Raju, The Divisional Commissioner, Saran Division At Chapra.
6. Shri Sushil Kumar, the Deputy Development Commissioner-Cum-Chairman, District Education Establishment Committee, Saran at Chapra.
7. Mr. Madhu Sudhan Paswan, the District Education Officer, Saran at Chapra.
8. Shri Ranjit Paswan, the District Superintendent of Education, Saran at Chapra.
9. Mr. Yogesh Chandra Singh, the Regional Deputy Director of Education, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
10. Mr. Raman Kumar, the Deputy Development Officer, Madhepura.
11. Mr. Prem Chand Prasad, the Block Development Officer Taraiya, District Saran.
12. Mr. Dineshwar Sharma, the Block Education Extension Officer, Taraiya-I, District- Saran.
13. Mr. Sanjeet Kumar the Block Development Officer, Revilganj, District Saran
14. Mr. Jagdish Bhagat, the Block Education Extension Officer, Revilganj, District Saran
15. Mr. Prem Chandra Prasad, the Block Development Officer, Dariyapur, District Saran
16. Mr. Satyanarayan Prasad, the Block Education Extension Officer, Dariyapur, District Saran.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sushil Kumar, G.P.22
Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, AC to G P 22

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
ORAL ORDER

6 09-08-2017

Keeping in view the order passed by the Principal



Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar on 09.05.2017 rejecting the claim of the petitioner after reconsideration with regard to granting recognition to the course in question, now in this contempt application, no further action is required to be taken. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the manner in which consideration is made and the claim rejected as is evident from Annexure-A dated 09.05.2017, petitioner shall have liberty to assail the same afresh in accordance with law.

With the aforesaid, the matter stands disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

Sunil/-

U			
---	--	--	--

