

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9540 of 2018

Umesh Kumar S/o Shri Shivnath Singh, R/o Ward No.11, Village- Siswa Korar, P.O.- Siswa Bazaar, P.S.- Paharpur, Distt- East Champaran, Motihari, presently posted as Incharge Headmaster, Utkramit Middle School, Pulwaghat, Block- Turkauliya, East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, East Champaran, Motihari.
6. The District Programme Officer Establishment, MDM, East Champaran, Motihari.
7. The District Education Officer, East Champaran, Motihari.
8. The Block Development Officer, Turkauliya, East Champaran, Motihari.
9. Arun Kumar, S/o not known, Block Education Officer, Turkauliya, East Champaran, Motihari.
10. Anand Kumar, S/o Shri Chandrika Ray, Presently posted as Block Teacher in Utkramit Middle School, Pulwaghat, Block- Turkauliya, Dist- East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Nikhil Kumar Agrawal, Adv. Ms. Aditi Hnsaria, Adv. Ms. Deepika Sharma, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Madanjeet Kumar- GP 20
For Respondent No.10	:	Mr. Vindhayachal Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

5 25-03-2019 In compliance of the order dated 5.3.2019 passed by this Court, the respondents no.4, 7 & 8 have filed a counter affidavit, wherein it has been stated that the salary of the petitioner, which was stopped earlier by the B.E.O., Turkauliya,



has been started and is being paid on the directions of the District Programme Officer (Establishment), East Champaran, Motihari and the arrears amounting to a sum of Rs. 3,20,795.00 has already been paid to the petitioner. It is further submitted that appropriate action has also been taken against the respondent no.10, hence, the writ petition has become infructuous.

The learned counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the submission made by the learned counsel for the respondents.

Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

Tiwary/-

U			
---	--	--	--

