

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2791 of 2024

=====

Satya Narayan Chaudhary Son of Kailash Chaudhary Resident of Baligarh,
Police Station-Runnisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Distirct Education Officer, Sitamarhi.
3. The Distirct Education Officer, (East), Sitamarhi.
4. The Distirct Panchayat Raj Officer, Sitamarhi.
5. The Block Education Officer, Runnidaidpur, Block-Runnisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.
6. The Panchayat Secretary-Cum-Secretary, Gram Panchayat Teachers Employment Unit, Deona Bujurg, Block-Runnisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.
7. Ravindra Paswan Son of Ram Sakal Paswan Resident of Village and Post Officer-Runnisaidpur Ghat, Block and Police Station-Runnisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader 16

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 11-11-2024

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. This writ application has been filed for the
following relief:-

*(i). A writ in the nature of certiorari setting
aside the impugned order bearing Memo No. 140
dated 26.08.2023 passed in Case No. 05 of 2023
by learned District Teacher's Appellate Authority
Sitamarhi whereby and where under the
appointment of petitioner on the post of
Panchayat Teacher has been cancelled and
private Respondent No. 7 has been directed to be*



appointed after placing him in merit list on the ground that Intermediate testimonials of petitioner of year 2004 is forged despite the fact that petitioner had applied for appointment on Panchayat Teacher on the basis of Intermediate Examination of vocational course of year 2008 which is correct and this aspect has not been verified from concerned Board.

(ii). To reinstate the petitioner on the post of Panchayat Teacher with all consequential monetary benefits.

3. At the outset, learned counsel for the State appears and raises preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of this writ application on the ground that petitioner has got alternative remedy before the State Appellate Authority. He further submits that no reason has been assigned, as to why this writ application shall be heard by this Hon'ble High Court, even when alternative remedy to move before the State Appellate Authority is available to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to dispute the contentions made on behalf of the State.

5. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of with direction to petitioner to move before the State Appellate Authority by filing appeal and the State Appellate Authority is directed to proceed in the matter and dispose of the same in accordance with law after hearing the



parties, preferably within a period of six months thereafter.

6. With the aforesaid observations and directions, this writ application is disposed of.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

utkarsh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

