

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22474 of 2019

=====

Prahalad Yadav @ Prahlad Yadav Son of Shri Amrit Yadav, Resident of
Village- Pipariya, PS- Pipariya, District- Lakhisarai, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Human Resource Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Human Resource Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The State Appellate Authority, Education Department, Bihar, at Patna.
4. The District Appellate Authority, Lakhisarai.
5. The District Education Officer, Lakhisarai.
6. The District Program Officer, Pipariya Block, District- Lakhisarai.
7. The Block Education Officer, Pipariya Block District- Lakhisarai.
8. The Block Employment Unit, Pipariya Block, District- Lakhisarai.
9. The Prakhanda Pramukh, Pipariya District- Lakhisarai.
10. The Member Block Education Samiti, Pipariya District- Lakhisarai.
11. Bindu Kumar, Son of Shri Badan Yadav, Resident of Village- Pipariya
Diyara, PS- Pipariya, District- Lakhisarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None.
For the Respondent/s : Ram Vinay Pd. Singh, AC to GA-12

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH
SHARMA**

ORAL ORDER

2 22-11-2022

1. No one appears for the petitioner.

2. The petitioner by way of this writ petition challenges the order passed by the District Appellate Authority dated 15.03.2019 and the order passed by the State Appellate Authority dated 02.07.2019, whereby the District Appellate Authority held that inquiry was not conducted before passing



the dismissal order and the provisions of Rule 15 (घ) of the Rules of 2012 had not been followed. The State Appellate Authority has also taken the same view with direction to conduct impartial transparent inquiry within a period of three months. The petitioner has not been able to show as to how he is affected by such an order of the District Appellate Authority. In the present petition, he is asserting that the dismissal order passed as against the respondent no.11 was legal and correct.

3. In the opinion of this Court, the petitioner is completely an outsider and he would have no authority to challenge the orders of the District Appellate Authority before the State Appellate Authority nor he has a locus to assert that the dismissal order passed against the respondent no.11 was legal.

4. The writ petition is wholly frivolous and is accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

amit/-
Item no.129

U			
---	--	--	--

