

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4284 of 2018

=====

Santosh Kumar S/o Sri Ganesh Kumar Mehta, Resident of Village-Sukhasan,
P.S. Singheswar, District-Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
4. The District Magistrate, Madhepura
5. The District Education Officer, Madhepura
6. The District Superintendent of Education, Madhepura
7. The Block Development Officer, Singheswar, District-Madhepura
8. The Block Education Extension Officer, Singheswar West, District Madhepura.
9. Panchayat Secretary, Sukhasan Gram Panchayat, Singheswar, District-Madhepura.
10. Mukhiya, Sukhasan Gram Panchayat, Singheswar, District-Madhepura
11. District Panchayat Teachers Appointment Appellate Tribunal, Madhepura, District Madhepura.
12. The State Appellate Authority, 5C-D, Niyojan Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.- 1.
13. The Bihar School Examination Board, Through its Secretary, Patna.
14. Ramdeo Thakur, S/o Late Bindeshari Thakur, Resident of Village-Belokarla, P.S. Murliganj, District-Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Subodh Kumar Jha, Adv. Mr. Krishna Kumar, Adv. Mr. Chandra Mohan Jha, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Madanjit Kumar-GP20
for the Respondent 13(BSEB):	:	Mr. Ajay, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

4 14-11-2022 1. The petitioner assails the order passed by the State Appellate Authority as well as the order passed by the District



Appellate Authority, whereby the appeal preferred by the petitioner has been rejected.

2. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner had challenged the appointment given to the respondent on the ground that the respondent had obtained appointment on the basis of forged mark-sheets and certificates.

3. Both the District Appellate Authority as well as State Appellate Authority have reached towards the conclusion after getting verification done from the concerned Board that the documents placed by the respondent for the purpose of appointment are not forged but are genuine.

4. The petitioner has again come before this Court challenging the orders and in support of his contention, he relies on a counter filed by the respondent number 13 i.e. Bihar School Examination Board wherein the deponent has mentioned in Para 6 that the enlistment number of the said respondent number connected C, D and enlistment no. of the respondent number 14 is missing whereas as per the main registration register the enlistment number MD/2507-92 is allotted to another candidate namely Amrendra Kumar and in this manner learned counsel submits that the documents are forged.



5. I have considered the submissions and perused the counter affidavit. In para 5 of the counter-affidavit of the Bihar School Examination Board it is stated that the verification report was submitted by them of the respondent number 14 and it has been specifically mentioned that he passed the examination with first division wherein roll code 6321, roll no. 30029 mentioning of enlistment number in para 6, appears to be deliberate on the part of the deponent and this Court deprecates the manner in which the counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the said deponent as in para 5 of his own. Be that as it may once two quasi-judicial authorities have already examined the record. No further interference is warranted by this Court under Article 227.

6. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

shaswat/-
Item no. 96

U			
---	--	--	--

