

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4540 of 2018

=====

Saumya Kumari @ Saumya Daughter of Ram Bhushan Chaubey, Resident of
Mohallah- Ram Jaipal Nagar, Gola Road, Danapur Cantt., P.S.- Rupaspur,
District- Patna, Pin Code- 801503 Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Patna.
5. The District Programme Officer, Patna.
6. The Block Development Officer, Maner, Patna.
7. The Block Education Extension Officer, Maner, Patna.
8. The Headmaster, Upgraded Middle School, Adarsh Gram, Madhopur, Maner, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Madanjeet Kumar- GP-20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

3 25-07-2022 Heard the parties.

Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the petitioner worked as a Block Teacher only for a short period from 11.11.2013 to 18.12.2014 and from 19.12.2014, she was continuously absent from duty. Several show cause letters were issued to her and in view of Rule 15(2) of the Rules of 2006, as the petitioner has remained continuously absent from duty for a long period. Show cause



notice was issued to terminate her service and accordingly her services were dispensed with vide order dated 30.08.2017. A letter to this effect regarding terminating service of the petitioner was issued on 04.09.2017. The petitioner has not challenged the said order in the present writ petition or otherwise. No reply to the counter affidavit has been filed.

Considering that the petitioner has remained absent from duty for a very long time i.e. 2013 continuously and seems to have abandoned her job, no regular enquiry was required to have been done. Show cause notice was issued which has not been explained properly. No interference is therefore warranted.

The writ petition is misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

amit/-
Item no.345

U			
---	--	--	--

