

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.2229 of 2015

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1302 of 2013

=====

Priti Kumari, Daughter of Sri Sita Ram Paswan @ Sita Ram Singh, resident of village - Amba (Hariharganj Road), P.S. Amba, District - Aurangabad

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad
3. The Block Development officer, Kutumba, District - Aurangabad
4. The Public Information - Cum - Sub Divisional officer, Aurangabad
5. The Panchayat Sevak, Matpa Gram Panchayat at Amba, District - Aurangabad
6. Raj Kumari, Wife of Pradeep Baitha, Resident of village - Ankuppa, P.S. Kutumba, District - Aurangabad

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Bhola Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, GA 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 06-09-2017

Seeking exception to an order dated 26.08.2015 passed by the learned Writ Court in CWJC No. 1302 of 2013 this appeal has been filed under Clause 10 of the Letters Patent.

In the matter of appointment of Panchayat Teacher a dispute has arisen between the present petitioner-appellant and respondent no. 6 and the matter went to the District Teachers Employment Appellate Tribunal, and on 13.08.2012 the issue was decided by the Tribunal against the petitioner and challenging the



same the writ petition in question was filed.

The learned Writ Court took note of various aspects of the matter and found that the petitioner has committed serious omission and on going through the pleadings it is found that the petitioner was communicated about her appointment by the Panchayat authority but on account of the petitioner’s own omission, in not correctly mentioning her father’s name, she could not be appointed.

The matter relates to the appointment which was made in the year 2007 and finding the appellant herself to be responsible in making incorrect address and particulars of her father which resulted in respondent no. 6 being appointed on the post in the year 2007, the learned Writ Court refused to interfere into the matter.

We find no error in the order of the learned Writ Court warranting reconsideration in this appeal. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

mrl

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	08.09.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

