

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17428 of 2010

=====

Chandeshwar Kumar S/O Banti Prasad R/O Vill & P.S.Sanepur, Distt-Saran
At Chhapra

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The District Magistrate Saran At Chhapra
2. The Member District Teachers Employment Appellate Tribunal Saran At Chhapra
3. The Sub Divisional Officer Sonapur, Distt-Saran At Chhapra
4. The District Superintendent Of Education Saran At Chhapra
5. The Block Development Officer Sonapur, Distt-Saran
6. The Block Education Extension Officer Sonapur, Distt-Saran At Chhapra
7. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Chaturpur, P.S.Sonapur, Distt-Saran At Chhapra
8. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Raj Chaturpur, P.S.Sonapur, Distt-Saran At Chhapra
9. The Up Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Raj Chaturpur, P.S.Sonapur, Distt-Saran

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Rakesh Kumar Rana, AC to GA-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 04-09-2018

Earlier when the case was listed for admission, no one had appeared to assist the Court. Today, the case has been listed under the heading “For Dismissal” in order to provide one more opportunity to the petitioner to assist the Court but unfortunately, no one appears on behalf of the petitioner. Under the aforesaid circumstances, the court is constrained to dispose of the writ petition on the basis of materials available on record.

2. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition for quashing the order dated 12.07.2010 as contained in Annexure-6, whereby the claim of the petitioner for appointment was rejected



by the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority. The petitioner has also prayed for a direction to the respondents for his appointment.

3. The District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority had considered the claim of the petitioner in Case No. 1334 of 2009 and while disposing of the appeal of one Priya Kumari in Case No. 1335 of 2009 on the basis of materials available on the record, it was held out that in the category to which the petitioner belonged, the Employment Unit had considered the case of the petitioner and one Vishal Kumar, who had secured 68.22 marks, whereas the petitioner had secured 66.55 marks and accordingly the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority held out that there was no infirmity in the selection of Vishal Kumar. While considering the subsequent development the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority held out that said Vishal Kumar had resigned and had got employment in Railway and against the said vacancy the petitioner may approach the competent authority which may consider his case for appointment against the vacancy created by Vishal Kumar.

4. Considering the discussions of the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority, the Court does not find any



infirmity in the decision and as such there is no merit in the claim of the petitioner.

5. The writ petition, being devoid of any merit, is dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

spandey/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	05.09.2018
Transmission Date	

