

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.97 of 2016

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1362 of 2013

=====

Santosh Kumar Roy, Son of Sri Mathur Chand Roy, R/O Village- Bobra, P.S.
Kadwa, District- Katihar

... Appellant ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department Of Human Resources Development, Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate Cum Collector, Katihar
3. The District Education Officer, Katihar
4. The District Superintendent Of Education, Katihar
5. The Block Development Officer, Kadwa Block, Katihar
6. The Block Education Extension Officer, Kadwa Block, Katihar
7. The Member District Teachers Selection Appellate Tribunal, Katihar
8. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Tetaliya, Kadwa Block, Katihar
9. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Tetaliya, Kadwa, Katihar
10. Smt. Najma Khatoon wife of Sri Zainul Abedin The Then Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Tetaliya, Kadwa, Katihar
11. Sri Md. Arif Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Tetaliya, Kadwa, Katihar
12. Arun Kumar Roy, Son of Sri Gauri Shankar Roy R/O Village- Pachgachi, P.O. Salmari, P.S. Kadwa, District- Katihar

.. Respondent/s-Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sushanta Kumar Das, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
and
HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN)

Date : 03-01-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.



This application has been filed for review of the order dated 08.12.2015 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in L.P.A. No.1362 of 2013 arising out of final order passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in C.W.J.C. No.21956 of 2012.

From perusal of the order under review, it appears that learned Single Judge called for the entire records of the Panchayat regarding counselling etc. for appointment of the Panchayat Teacher and, after going through the records, has held that there was no adequate notice to the parties as final notice was never given to the parties as only notice was affixed on the notice board and the same was published in the newspaper, whereas, personal notice should have been given to the persons informing the date and time of counselling as a result of which only 12 candidates out of 120 candidates appeared for counselling. In such a situation, the appointments were set aside and a direction was given to hold fresh counselling after notice to the parties and other selected candidates on merit.

The Division Bench has upheld the aforesaid view in appeal.

In our view, the review petitioner can hardly be affected adversely by the aforesaid order for the reason that if he is holding sufficient qualification then he would have a chance for



appointment. That apart, we do not see any defect in the orders of the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench.

As a result, this review application is dismissed.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Sanjay/-

(Anjana Mishra, J)

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	12.01.2018
Transmission Date	NA

