

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1185 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1056 of 2014

=====

Pramila Kumari, wife of Sri Lallan Kumar, Resident of Village-Tinari, P.O.-
Tinari, P.S.-Guraru, District-Gaya.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
3. The Block Development Officer, Guraru, Gaya.
4. The Secretary of Panchayat Teachers Appointment Committee, Gram
Panchayat Barorah, P.S. Guraru, District-Gaya
5. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Barorah, P.S.-Guraru, District-Gaya.
6. The Panchayat Sachiv Barorah, P.S.-Guraru, District-Gaya.
7. Pushpa Kumari, Daughter of Shree Sidheshwar Prasad, R/o Village and Post-
Digha, P.S.-Gurira, District-Gaya (Bihar).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Shyameshwar Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. C. Swaroop, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Amrendra Kumar, AC to AAG-15
For Respondent no.7	:	Mr. Nagendra Sharma, Advocate Mr. Amar Prakash, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 17-12-2018

Re.: Interlocutory Application No. 6219 of 2017

Heard Sri Shyameshwar Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the appellant, Sri Nagendra Sharma, learned counsel for the
respondent no.7-petitioner, and Sri Amarendra Kumar, learned
counsel for the State and its authorities.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we are
satisfied that delay has been sufficiently explained.



The delay is condoned and the appeal shall be treated within time.

Re.: Letters Patent Appeal No.1185 of 2017

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, one of the main issues that has been raised by the learned for the appellant is that the documents on which the reliance had been placed by the respondent no.7- petitioner, particularly with regard to her educational qualification and experience certificate, did not inspire confidence as the name of the guardian (father or husband) had not been correctly depicted. It was pointed out that the name of the father of the respondent no.7-petitioner in the Bihar Intermediate Education Council Certificate is Sidheshwar Prasad, whereas in the experience certificate issued to the respondent no.7-petitioner under the *Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan Scheme* reflects that the respondent no.7-petitioner is the daughter of one Binod Kumar. This issue of identity has been thrashed-out by the learned Single Judge and we have also examined the two documents and what we find is that there is a tick mark against the word 'husband' in the experience certificate. This therefore establishes that Binod Kumar is the husband of the respondent no.7-petitioner and not her father. The issue therefore, raised on the strength of such alleged



discrepancy by the appellant is unfounded and is not borne out from the record.

The other issues have also been dealt with by the learned Single Judge exhaustively and we find no reason to differ from the view taken by the learned Single Judge. The appeal lacks merits and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)

(Anjana Mishra, J)

Sunil/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	17.12.2018
Transmission Date	

