

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1851 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23856 of 2013

-
-
1. Anju Kumari, Daughter Of Rajeshwar Prasad Mandal, Wife Of Satrughan Kumar Mandal, Resident Of Village - Tharhi, P.S. - Laukahi, District - Madhubani
 2. Jayanti Kumari Wife Of Ashok Kumar Yadav Resident Of Village - Sahorba, P.S. - Laukaha, District - Madhubani
 3. Kiran Kumari Daughter Of Yaduvir Prasad Yadav Resident Of Village - Phulparas, P.S. - Phulparas, Distt. - Madhubani
 4. Rameshwar Prasad Saran Son Of Sundar Lal Saran Resident Of Village - Tengrar, P.S. - Khutauna, District - Madhubani
 5. Laxman Yadav Son Of Kailu Yadav Resident Of Village - Piprahi, P.S. - Laukahi, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sri Dharmendra Singh Gangwar, son of name not known to the petitioner, at present working as the Principal Secretary (Primary Education) Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Sri A.Ahmad, son of name not known to the petitioner, at present District Programme Officer, Madhubani.
4. Sri Sudhir Kumar, son of name not known to the petitioner, at present Block Development Officer, Laukahi, District- Madhubani.
5. Sri Sikander Prasad Mandal, son of name not known to the petitioner, at present Block Education Extension Officer, Laukahi, District- Madhubani.
6. Sri Sibo Devil, the Pramukh, Laukahi Panchayat Samiti, District- Madhubani.
7. The Block Teachers Selection Committee, Laukahi, District- Madhubani.

... .. Respondent

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kripa Nand Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. GA7 Subhash Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 20-08-2018 The petitioners are not showing that their names are placed among the 85 candidates to fill up the 85 vacancies of the



Block Teacher of which 22 vacancies for General category. The petitioners are also not showing that any person standing below in the merit list compared to the petitioners has been appointed. The order of the learned Writ Court was that “...Subject to the number of vacancies advertised, the decision to fill up the specified number of posts and the merit position of the petitioner in panel, let his case be considered in accordance with law and a reasoned and speaking order passed within a maximum period of two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.....”

In the Show Cause filed on behalf of the opposite party nos. 3, 4 and 5, now a categorical statement has been made that the petitioners’ names do not appear in the merit list, therefore, the appointment letter has not been issued. A copy of the entire merit list and waiting list have been brought on record as Annexures A and C to the show cause.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has attempted to demonstrate that the petitioners were required to be appointed, however, in the given facts and circumstances, not controverted by the petitioners, this Court is unable to proceed with the contempt application.

This contempt application is disposed of with liberty



to the petitioners to avail their remedy, if so advised, in
accordance with law.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-

U			
---	--	--	--

