

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9717 of 2022

=====

Mukesh Kumar Son of Ravindra Sharma, Resident of Village- Gangti, P.S.-
Men, District- Gaya, (Panchayat Teacher of primary School Gangti Men,
Gaya.

... .. 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, Gaya.
4. The District Education Officer, Gaya.
5. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Gaya.
6. The Block Development Officer, Belaganj, Gaya.
7. The Block Education Officer, Belaganj, Gaya.
8. The Chairman Gram Panchayat Primary Teachers Niyojan Committee
Koriyawan, Belaganj, Gaya.
9. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Koriyawan Belaganj, Gaya.
10. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Koriyawan, Belaganj, Gaya.
11. The Headmistress, Primary School Gangti, Koriyawan Belaganj, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binod Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Madhaw Pd. Yadaw (Gp23)
Ms. Meera Singh, AC o GP 23

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-03-2023 Heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned.

The petitioner is a panchayat teacher. The limited
grievance of the petitioner is for acceptance of his joining and
sanction of leave for the period between 12.01.2019 and
05.01.2022, during which, according to the petitioner, he was
undergoing treatment.

The petitioner has submitted his joining on



06.01.2022 and by order, dated 18.01.2022 (Annexure-4) passed by the Panchayat Secretary, Koriyawan Gram Panchayat, Belaganj, Gaya, his joining was accepted without any salary for the period of leave.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that by Annexure-5, i.e. another letter issued by the Panchayat Secretary, Koriyawan Gram Panchayat, Belaganj, Gaya, dated 19.01.2022, the petitioner was directed to submit certain documents so that a decision with regard to sanction of his leave can be taken by the competent authority. By Annexures 6 and 7, the petitioner submitted all the required documents, as demanded vide Annexure 5, but no decision has yet been taken by the competent authority regarding sanction of his leave.

Learned Counsel for the State, in reply, submits that it is a fact that a decision on the point of sanction of leave of the petitioner for the aforesaid period has not been taken.

In view of the aforesaid submission advanced on behalf of the parties, I direct the competent authority to take a decision upon the leave of the petitioner for the aforesaid period, during which, the petitioner claims that he was undergoing treatment, within a period of one month from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.



This writ application is disposed with the aforesaid observation and direction.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√		
---	---	--	--

