

Pravin Kumar, Son of Late Nandeshwar Das, Resident of Village- Daud Nagar (Puri Machhala), P.S.- Daud Nagar, District- Aurangabad

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary.
2. The Director, Primary Education, New Secretariat, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Primary Education, New Secretariat, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad, District- Aurangabad.
5. The District Education Officer, Aurangabad, District- Aurangabad.
6. The District Programme Officer Establishment Aurangabad, District- Aurangabad.
7. The Block Development Officer, Madanpu Block, District- Aurangabad.
8. The Block Education Officer, Madanpur Block, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ramashray Roy, AC to Ex. AAG-11

9 06-02-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has filed the instant application praying for a direction to the respondents to give regular pay scale to the petitioner on his appointment as a Prakhanda Teacher, the petitioner having been appointed on compassionate ground on the death of his father during active service in the Education Department.

3. The case of the petitioner in brief is that on the



death of his father on 8.7.2014, the petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Teacher on 31.12.2014. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that similarly situated person namely Vishwanath Pandey, who was also appointed on compassionate ground, on the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, was granted regular pay scale. The petitioner has not been granted the same. As such the writ application.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the Bihar Panchayat Primary Teachers (Appointment and Service Conditions) Rules, 2006 ('2006 Rules' in short) came into effect w.e.f 1.7.2006. Rule 10 thereof provides for compassionate appointment of the wards of teaching and non-teaching employees only on the post of Panchayat/Prakhand teacher which is to be done after obtaining their consent at a fixed monthly amount of Rs. 5,000/- or Rs. 4,000/- depending on whether the person being appointed is trained or untrained.

5. It is categorical case of the respondents that the father of the petitioner having died in the year 2014, Rule 10 of the above Rules would be applicable in his case. So far as the reliance placed by the petitioner on the case of Vishwanath Pandey is concerned, it is submitted by learned counsel for the State that the decision in the said case is



distinguishable insofar as the serving Assistant Teacher in the said case had died on 14.10.2004 and the petitioner therein had filed his application on 5.2.2005 ie both before coming of the 2006 Rules. Thus it is submitted that on framing and implementation of the 2006 Rules w.e.f 1.7.2006 and the petitioner having been appointed pursuant to the provisions as provided in Rule 10 therein, there is no merit in the writ application and the same be dismissed.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the material on record, it transpires that consequent to the death of the father of the petitioner on 8.7.2014, the petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Teacher on compassionate ground on 31.12.2014. It is the categorical case of the parties as stated in paragraph no.8 of the counter affidavit of respondent no.2 that upon consent of the petitioner having been taken, he was appointed as a Prakhanda Teacher on compassionate ground vide order dated 31.12.2014. The petitioner having accepted the terms of his appointment which was in accordance with Rule 10 of the 2006 Rules and having been appointed consequent to his consent having been given to such appointment, cannot now pray for grant of regular pay scale.



7. The Court thus finds no merit in the instant application and the same is dismissed.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

