

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4899 of 2023

Jugnu Kumari Wife of Sri Satyadev Singh, Resident of Village-Shadipur, P.O.
and P.S.-Goriyakothi, District-Siwan.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The District Education Officer, Gopalganj.
4. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Gopalganj.
5. National Institute of Open Schooling through its Regional Director, Lalit Bhawan, Patna.
6. Regional Director, National Institute of Open Schooling, Lalit Bhawan, Patna.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Amit Bhushan, AC to GP-17
For the NIOS	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, CGC

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 07-08-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the National Institute of Open Schooling (in short 'NIOS') and its Regional Director.

2. The petitioner in the present case is seeking a writ in the nature of writ of Mandamus commanding the respondents to consider, adjudicate and take a decision on the request of the petitioner to carry on a correction in her marksheet/result of Teachers Training Examination for the Session 2017-19.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has been appointed as a Block Teacher in Barauli Block within the district of Gopalganj. In this regard a letter of appointment/engagement has been issued to her vide Letter No. 38 dated 14.02.2014. The petitioner claims that she had submitted her joining in the respective place of posting before the Headmaster of Upgraded middle School, Mahammadpur Turi which was also accepted.

4. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was sent for training i.e. D.El.Ed. Course and for that purpose, she was relieved from the school. The petitioner claims that she completed her training course and thereafter she was allowed to appear in the examination conducted by the Respondent No. 5 in the year 2017-19. It is her grievance that unfortunately, the marks allotted in different subjects were wrongly entered in her marksheet and she was declared unsuccessful.

5. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has represented her claim before the competent authority i.e. Respondent No. 6 but the same has not been considered.

6. Learned counsel for the Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 submits that from the statements made in the writ application, it appears that the petitioner is looking for re-evaluation of her answer-sheets which may not be possible in absence of any



provision for the same, however, since the petitioner has submitted a representation, the Respondent No. 6 may be directed to consider the same in accordance with law as per norms and procedures which may be available with regard to such examination and result at the end of Respondent No. 5.

7. Having regard to the aforementioned submissions, this writ application is being disposed of with a direction to Respondent No. 6 to look into the grievance of the petitioner and consider the same keeping in view the Rules, norms and procedures governing the concerned examination and the result at the end of Respondent No. 5. He would be competent to take an appropriate decision which would be communicated to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

8. This writ application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

