

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4574 of 2018**

---

1. Dinesh Kumar Deepak and Ors Son of Late Shyam Sunder Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-Mekhra, P.O. Mekra, Block Mokama, P.S. Mokama, District-Patna.
2. Bindeshwari Mahto, Son of Late Chhatthu Mahto, Resident of Village-Sultanpur, Post Office Kanhaipur Block, Mokama, P.S. Mokama, District-Patna.
3. Kunta Kumari Wife of Subodh Kumar Rai Resident of Village-Mekra PoliceStation Mokama, Post Mekra District-Patna
4. Subodh Kumar Rai, Son of Late Vasudeo rai, Resident of Village-Mekra Post Mekra P.S. Mokama, District-Patna
5. Prem Nath Tiwari, Son of Late Ram Chandra Tiwari, Resident of Village-Mekra Post Mekra P.S. Mekra, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Mass Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Patna.
6. The District Education Officer, Patna.
7. The Block Education Extension Officer, Mokama.

... .. Respondent/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prem Ranjan Kumar, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kameshwar Kumar -GP-17

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

8      25-09-2023      Heard the parties.

2. This application has been preferred for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate Writ and/or order and/or directions, commanding and directing the respondents for the following reliefs:



(i) to absorb the petitioners on the post of Class III/IVth under the respondent State as the petitioners are Ex-Instructor of Adult and Non-formal Education on several grounds including that the State Government has decided to absorb the Non-Formal Education Supervisor on III/IV Posts;

(ii) Any/ any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioners are found to be entitled in the facts and circumstances of case.

3. The story goes back to decade ago when taking into account the fact that Non Formal Supervisor were rehabilitated, direction was issued to take similar view in case of Non Formal Instructors.

4. The first case was CWJC No. 8418 of 2010 and this followed LPA No. 1489 of 2011 followed by number of writ petition/appeals.

5. Finally, Hon'ble the Apex Court in **SLP (C) No. 32079 of 2015 (The State of Bihar & Ors. Vs Prabhat Ranjan)** held as follows:

*“We find infirmity in the order impugned herein. The Special Leave Petitions are dismissed.*

*The relief granted by the High Court shall be restricted to those who approached the High Court who were heard*



*as well as who wanted to get themselves impleaded and those who have filed applications here at par with those former as well as all those petitioner Instructors which are pending as on date before the High Court but shall not apply to any fresh case either here or before the High Court.*

*Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of. “*

7. Those who missed the bus earlier thereafter started approaching the High Court, the petitioner being one of them.

8. Some of such matters were pending in Civil Review No. 59 of 2018 arising out of LPA No. 1047 of 2017.

9. The same has finally been disposed of and it is necessary to incorporate the concluding parts which is/are as follows:

*“16. The issue has now attained its finality with the final decision of the Supreme Court rendered on 02.12.2021, in case of **The State of Bihar and others V/s Meera Kumari and another**, relevant portion of which has been noted hereinabove. The Supreme Court has reiterated that whereas it is true that generally similarly situated persons, irrespective of whether they moved the Court*



*or not, must be similarly treated, the said principle cannot be applied when the Supreme Court had spoken and pronounced the order in terms as the order dated 26.02.2016.*

*17. The Supreme Court's decision in case of **the State of Bihar and others V/s Meera Kumari and another**, is near reiteration of specific observations made by the Supreme Court in its order dated 26.02.2016.*

*18. It is an admitted fact that the private respondents (writ petitioners) had not approached this Court or the Supreme Court either by filing writ application or intervention application or otherwise on or before 26.02.2016.*

*19. In view of the Supreme Court order dated 26.02.2016 and the subsequent decision rendered on 02.12.2021 in case of **the State of Bihar and others V/s Meera Kumari and another**, in order to obviate any scope of doubt, we conclude that no person, claiming to have been appointed as an instructor under Non Formal Education Scheme, can seek absorption on the strength of a Co-ordinate Bench decision of this Court in case of **the State Government of Bihar and others V/s Sheo Bhajan Prasad Diwakar and others**, unless*



*it is demonstrated that he/she is eligible to be considered in the light of the observation made by the Supreme Court in its order dated 26.02.2016 (supra), subsequently reiterated and explained by the Supreme Court in its decision dated 02.12.2021 in the case of **the State of Bihar and others V/s Meera Kumari and another**. Situated thus, we are of the opinion that as the order under review was passed by this Court in ignorance of the interim order passed by the Supreme Court dated 25.01.2017, in the case of **the State of Bihar and others V/s Meera Kumari and another**, and in the light of the admitted fact that the private respondents have not approached either this Court or the Supreme Court on or before 26.02.2016, the order dated 23.01.2018 passed in LPA No. 1047 of 2017 is liable to be recalled. The decision of the learned Single Judge dated 03.03.2017 passed in CWJC No. 384 of 2017, which was filed by the writ petitioners, is based on a Co-ordinate Bench's decision of this Court in the case of **the State of Bihar and others V/s Meera Kumari and another**. An order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 03.03.2017, which was challenged by the State of Bihar by preferring LPA No. 1047 of 2017, reads as under:*



*"In between an issue was raised by one Meera Kumari and Punam Devi before this Court by filing Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case NO. 3765/2016 complaining that the relief was being restricted to only those persons who are party to the proceedings and not being extended to other similarly situated persons. The Division Bench clarified the position by passing the following order:*

*" 3. To us, problem is simple. The Apex Court, in the case of Ashwani Kumar & others v/ State of Bihar & others, since reported in AIR 1997 Supreme Court 1628, in paragraph 17, has clearly held that all persons, similarly situated, whether they have moved the Court or not, must be similarly treated. Those, who were waiting in the wings, cannot be denied the relief which is granted by the Court unless the relief is personal to the person. In our view, similar is the provision of Clause 4(c) of the Bihar State Litigation Policy which clearly envisages that not everybody is required to move the Court. Persons, in similar circumstances, must be treated similarly.*

*4. In that view of the matter, all we say is if the authorities find that the petitioners are similarly circumstanced to the other persons, they would be similarly*



*treated.*

*In view of the developments noted above, the case of the petitioners would also require a consideration by the respondents. It is stated by Mr. Mishra that although these petitioners have already applied but the matter is not being disposed of.*

*Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering that the issue stands settled, I deem it proper to dispose of all these writ petitions with a direction to respondents no. 2 to 4 to consider the claim of the petitioners in the backdrop of the issues settled by the Court and dispose of the same within a maximum period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.*

*All the writ petitions are accordingly disposed of."*

*20. As has been discussed above, as the writ petitioners had admittedly not approached this Court or the Supreme Court on or before 26.02.2016, no relief could have been granted to them. The writ petition filed by them, i.e., CWJC No. 384 of 2017, deserved to be dismissed. Accordingly, we set aside the order dated 03.03.2017 passed in CWJC No. 384 of 2017.*

*21. Accordingly, the review application stands allowed. The writ petition*



*is accordingly dismissed. The LPA No. 1047 of 2017 stands allowed.*

*22. All Interlocutory applications stand disposed of. “*

10. As stated above, the admitted fact is that case of the petitioner is after the cut off date of 26.02.2016.

11. After having waited in the wings for years, the petitioners chose to belatedly approach this Court when the doors were closed, in view of the disposal of the Civil Review No. 59 of 2018 dated 05.07.2023, as stated above, no relief can be granted to them.

12. The writ petition stands dismissed.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

kiran/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

