

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1762 of 2016

Arvind Kumar Son of Alakhdeo Prasad Ambastha, resident of Village-
Sesamba, Police Station- Shakurabad in the district of Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Mid Day Meal Scheme, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Jehanabad.
5. The District Programme Officer, Mid Day Meal Scheme, Jehanabad.
6. The Headmaster-cum-Drawing Disbursing officer, Makhdumpur in the district of Jehanabad.

... .. Respondent/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 21343 of 2018

Bihar Rajya Prarambhik Shikshak Sangh S/o Matiur Rahman, Resident of
Village- Birnia, P.S.- Bahadurganj, District- Kishanganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India
2. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resource Development, Bihar
3. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, Bihar State Mid Day Meal Scheme Committee, Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Kishanganj.
6. The District Education Officer, Kishanganj.
7. The District Programme Officer Estb., Kishanganj.
8. The District Programme Officer, Mid Day Meal Programme, Kishanganj.

... .. Respondent/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 22068 of 2019

Geeta Pathak W/o Kumar Prem Piyush Pathak Resident of Pathak Niketan,
Mohalla- Nand Lal Tola, Husse Chpra Saran, P.s.- Chapra Town, distt.- Saran.
At present and working as Headmaster in Govt. Kanya Upgraded Middle
School, Newazi Tola, block- Sadar Chapra, Distt.- Saran



... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Additional Chief Secretary Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director Primary Education, Bihar, patna
4. The District Magistrate Saran
5. The District Education Officer Saran
6. The District Programme Officer (Establishment) Saran
7. The District Programme Officer Midday Meal Scheme Saran
8. The Block Education Officer Sadar Chapra, Siwan
9. The Treasury Officer Saran

... .. Respondent/s

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 22420 of 2019

Raj Kumar Singh, Son of Sarabjeet Singh, Resident of Village-Chota Raghunathpur, Ward No. 5, P.S.-Amdabad, District-Katihar, at present Incharge Head master of Middle School, Navarasiya, Block-Amdabad, District-Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Purnea Division, Purnea.
5. The District Education Officer, Katihar, District-Katihar.
6. The District Programme Officer, (Madhyam Bhojan Project), Katihar, District-Katihar.
7. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Katihar, District-Katihar.
8. The Block Education Officer, Amdabad, District-Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1762 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Prashant Pratap- Gp6

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 21343 of 2018)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Madanjeet Kumar- Gp20



For Union of India : Mr. Alok Kumar, CGC
(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 22068 of 2019)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Kumar Mishra
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Smt. Shilpa Singh (Ga12)
(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 22420 of 2019)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Madhaw Prasad Yadaw (Gp23)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 14 22-03-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned, in this batch of writ applications.
2. Learned Counsel for the State submits that the petitioners are the Head Masters/Incharge Headmasters/teachers of different schools and have challenged the order directing them to deposit/refund the excess amount received by them for providing mid-day meal.
3. Learned Counsel for the State submits that upon inspection, it was found that the number of children were less than the attendance made by the petitioner.
4. Taking into consideration the nature of dispute, in my opinion, it is appropriate for the Director, Mid Day Meal, to hear both the parties and pass a final order upon the letter of recovery issued by the respondents.
5. Accordingly, I direct the Director, Mid Day Meal, to fix a date for appearance of the petitioners and respondents before him, for giving them personal hearing and deciding the matter by a reasoned order.



- 6. The entire exercise must be completed by the Director within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.
- 7. With the aforesaid observation and direction, these writ applications are disposed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√		
---	---	--	--

