

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1807 of 2018

-
-
1. Saroj Kumar Ram, Son of Ganesh Ram, Resident of Village- Pipra Sen, P.S.- Minapur, District- Muzaffarpur.
 2. Rinku Kumari, Daughter of Birendra Sah, Resident of Village- Naurangsahpur, P.S.- Karja, District- Muzaffarpur.
 3. Mukesh Kumar, Son of Late Harendra Choudhary, Resident of Village- Brahampura, P.S.- Brahampura, District- Muzaffarpur.
 4. Nirmala Kumari, Daughter of Rajmangal Sah, Resident of Village- Rasulpur, P.S.- Ahiyapur, District- Muzaffarpur.
 5. Pramila Kumari, Daughter of Rajmangal Sah, Resident of Village- Bhuaaridih, P.S.- Rajepur, District- East Champaran.
 6. Jeetendra Kumar Singh, Son of Mohit Prasad Singh, Resident of Village- Kharhar, P.S.- Meenapur, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
2. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
3. The District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur.
4. The District Program Officer (Establishment), Muzaffarpur.
5. The Block Education Officer, Minapur, Muzaffarpur.
6. The Member Secretary-cum-Gram Panchayat Secretary, Tengrari, Block- Minapur, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amish Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey -AAG15

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-02-2018 Due to inadvertence in the order dated 2.2.2018 instead of LPA No. 501 of 2017 reference was made to the order in C.W.J.C. No. 14493 of 2008 dated 21.3.2012. The same is a mistake, in fact, the case of the petitioner is covered by the decision of the Division Bench in LPA No. 501 of 2017 dated 14.2017.

In view of the above, the order dated 2.2.2018 may be read as the case of the petitioner is covered by the decision of



the Division Bench in LPA No. 501 of 2017 dated 14.11.2017, Annexure-2, the writ petition is disposed of with similar terms and direction to the respondents to proceed in accordance with law reinstating the petitioners.

It is made clear that for the intervening period no salary will be paid to the petitioners. The salary of the petitioners would depend upon the final outcome of the enquiry conducted by the respondents so far as it relates to the petitioners.

In view of the aforesaid, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

