

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1810 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6418 of 2016

=====

Ugra Narayan Yadav S/o Late Sumrit Yadav, 'Up-Mukhia' (the then), Gram Panchayat Raj - Basuari Resident of Village - Basuari, Block - Ghoghardiha, P.S. - Ghoghardiha, District - Madhubani.

... .. (Petitioner in the writ application) Appellant/s
Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director (State Project), Bihar Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad, Patna.
4. The Managing Director, Bihar State Educational Infrastructure Development Ltd., Shiksha Bhawan, Acharya Shivpujan Sahay Path, Saidpur, Patna.
5. The Deputy Director, Regional Education, Darbhanga.
6. The District Collector, Madhubani.
7. The District Education Officer, Madhubani.
8. The District Program Officer, Madhubani.
9. The Dy. Development Commissioner, Madhubani.
10. The Block Education Extension Officer, Ghoghardiha, P.S. - Ghoghardiha, District - Madhubani.
11. Alola Utkramit Madhya Vidyalaya through its Principal, Village - Alola, P.S. - Ghoghardiha, District
12. Sadurshan Lal Bihari High School through its Principal, Village - Basuari, P.S. - Ghoghardiha, District- Madhubani.
13. Basuara Utkramit Madhya Vidyalaya through its Principal, Village - Basuari, P.S. - Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani.

... .. (Respondents in the writ application)- Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Madhu Prasun, Advoate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kapileshwar Pd.Yadav-GP11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

12 13-12-2019

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The impugned order dated 08.08.2016 passed by a



learned Single Judge of this Court in CWJC No.6418 of 2016 titled as Ugra Narayan Yadav Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors., in toto reads as under:-

“Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The Division Bench had earlier opined that dispute of such kind is not required to be put under judicial scrutiny or the Court is not required to exercise its discretion on such decision. It is best left to the local people and the authorities to examine the efficacy of the prayer made in the writ application. Even otherwise, there are many controversial facts, which cannot be decided in a summary proceeding. Petitioner may pursue the matter with the local authorities, saddled with the power to take such decision in larger public interest.

Writ application stands dismissed with observation / direction as above.”

We do not find any illegality/infirmity in the order which is self serving. The appeal stands dismissed.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Sunil/-

U			
---	--	--	--

