

Bishwanath Singh Son of Deo Raj Singh Resident of Village- Gamrhi, P.S. Fesher, District- Aurangabad, at present Tirhut Nagar, P.S.- Bermo, District- Bokaro (Jharkhand). ... .. Petitioner/s

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Secretary, Primary Education, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar.
4. District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
5. District Education Officer, Aurangabad.
6. District Programme Officer, Establishment, Aurangabad.
7. Block Development Officer, Aurangabad.
8. Block Education Officer, Aurangabad.
9. Mukhiya Gram Panchayat, Sargawan, Deo, District Aurangabad.
10. Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Sargawan, Deo, District- Aurangabad.
11. Sushma Kumari Daughter of Shideshwar Singh resident of Village Kesor, Deo, District- Aurangabad.
12. Krishna Murari Son of Balgovind Sharma Resident of Village Purani Sahar, Barbiga, District Sheikhpura.
13. Sanjeev Kumar Singh Son of Gupta Singh Resident of Village/ Mohalla New Area Aurangabad, P.S. Aurangabad, District Aurangabad.
14. Sangeeta Kumari Wife of Shashi Bhushan Kumar Resident of Village Bhagwanbiga, P.S. Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

|                            |   |                                |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | NONE                           |
| For the Respondent/s       | : | Mr.Madhaw Prasad Yadav (GP 23) |
|                            | : | Mr. Arvind Kumar, AC to GP 23  |
| For Pvt.Resp.no. 11 to 14: |   | Mr. Niraj Kumar                |

3      04-01-2024      1.              No one appears for the petitioner, however learned  
counsel for the State as well as private respondents no. 11 to 14  
are present.

2.              The petitioner has filed the present writ application



for quashing the order dated 15.07.2015, passed by the District Teachers Employment Appellate Tribunal, Aurangabad in Case no. 47 of 2013, whereby and whereunder the appeal filed by the petitioner has been dismissed.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that instead of filing an appeal before the State Appellate Authority against the impugned order dated 15.07.2015, the petitioner has filed the present writ application, however the petitioner can challenge the impugned order before the State Appellate Authority.

4. Regards being had to the submissions made by learned counsel for the State and considering the fact that the petitioner, instead of challenging the impugned order before the State Appellate Authority, has approached this Court directly, I deem it fit and appropriate to dismiss the present writ application, however with liberty to the petitioner to approach the State Appellate Authority.

5. The writ petition stands disposed off on the aforesaid terms.

**(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)**

rinkee/-

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

