

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18371 of 2014

- =====
1. Chandan Kumar Dutta, Son of Sri Atul Krishna Dutta, Resident of Village - Gram Panchayat Raj Bhawanipur Khatti, Police Station - Amdabad, District- Katihar.
 2. Meera Das, D/o Sri Yogendra Nath Das, Resident of Village - Kehunia, Police Station - Pranpur, District- Katihar.
 3. Chandana Kumari, Wife of Sourabh Kumar, Resident of Village - Gopalpur, Police Station - Amdabad, District- Katihar.
 4. Pranav Kumar Saha, Son of Chandan Kumar Saha, Resident of Village - Alepur, Police Station - Barari, District- Katihar.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through Secretary Department of Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Katihar.
4. The District Education Officer, Katihar.
5. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Katihar.
6. The Block Development Officer, Amdabad, Katihar.
7. The Block Education Extension Officer, Amdabad, Katihar.
8. The Head Master, Primary School, Banku Tola, Bhawanipur Khatii, Amdabad, Katihar.
9. The Head Master, New Primary School, Raj Mahal Colony, Bhawanipur Khatti, Amdabad, Katihar.
10. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Raj, Bhawanipur Khatti, Amdabad, Katihar.
11. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj, Bhawanipur Khati, Amdabad, Katihar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad Sah, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sushant Praveen, AC to SC 9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 28-08-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and State.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners with reference to supplementary affidavit contended that during the pendency of the writ application petitioner nos. 1 and 4 have been paid salary, vide order dated 16.05.2018, although the case



of petitioner nos. 2 and 3 is identical to that of petitioner nos. 1 and 4, but the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 have not been paid salary. He submits that the other grievance of the petitioners has been redressed and the only limited prayer in the present writ application is for payment of salary to petitioner nos. 2 and 3.

3. Considering the above, the writ application is disposed of with a direction to the respondent District Programme Officer (Establishment), Katihar to examine the record and if it is found that the case of petitioner nos. 2 and 3 are identical to that of petitioner nos. 1 and 4, similar treatment should be extended to petitioner nos. 2 and 3 also. Necessary decision in this regard must be taken by the respondent District Programme Officer (Establishment), Katihar within a maximum period of four months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Uday/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	29.08.2018
Transmission Date	

