

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4687 of 2016

=====

Sushila Devi @ Sushila Kumari wife of Shri Surendra Prasad Sah, resident
of village- Madhudabad, P.s.- Mohiuddin Nagar, District- Samastipur

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Education Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director Education Department, Patna
3. The Bihar State Education Project Director, Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Samastipur
5. The District Superintendent of Education cum District Project Officer,
Samastipur
6. The Block Education Extension Officer, Mohiuddin Nagar, District-
Samastipur
7. The Block Development Officer, Mohiuddin Nagar District- Samastipur
8. The District Programme Coordinator, District- Samastipur
9. The District Education Project Officer, District- Samastipur
10. The Headmaster, Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya, Mohiuddin Nagar
District- Samastipur
11. Praveen Kumar (full time Urdu Teacher) Kasturba Gandhi Balika
Vidyalaya, Mohiuddin Nagar, District- Samastipur

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh
For the Respondent s : Mr. GP23- Anil Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 24-07-2018 Heard the parties.

Following reliefs have been sought for in the present
writ application on behalf of the petitioner:

- (i) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the
nature of certiorari for quashing the order
dated 06-05-2015 vide Memo No.
30/96/KGBV, Samastipur as contained in



Annexure-9 whereby and whereunder the claim of the petitioner for extension of contract was rejected and further for direction.

The petitioner's engagement was made against a teaching post for a period of one year at Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya, Mohiuddinnagar, Samastipur. The said engagement was purely contractual in nature and under the scheme of Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan.

Considering the nature of engagement/appointment, the petitioner does not get right for continuation. The termination order has been effected. In the circumstances, it is not required to be gone into under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The remedy for the petitioner may lie under common law but not under Article-226 of the Constitution of India.

If so advised, the petitioner may prefer a suit before the competent court for redressal of her grievance.

With the aforesaid observation/direction, the present writ application stands disposed of.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

A.K.V./-

U			
---	--	--	--

