

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16307 of 2023

=====

Rina Devi Wife of Satish Kumar, Resident of Village- Somnaha Chaksima,
Ward No.02, Police Station- Chakmehsi, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Samastipur.
4. The District Programme Officer (ICDS), Samastipur.
5. The Child Development Officer, Kalyanpur, Samastipur.
6. The Chairman, the Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna.
7. The Secretary, the Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna.
8. The Head Master, Sanskrit High School, Singhiyahi, Ladaura, Police Station-Kalyanpur, District- Samastipur.
9. Manisha Kumari, Wife of Sri Manoj Singh, Resident of Village- Somnaha Chaksima, Ward No.02, Police Station- Chakmehsi, District- Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S.K. Mandal (SC-3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 22-04-2024 The present writ petition has been filed
seeking the following relief:-

*“1. That the petitioner prays for
issuance of an appropriate writ/writs,
order/orders, direction/directions for
quashing the order dated 11.7.2022
passed in Case No.387/2019 (Rina
Devi Vs. C.D.P.O. Kalyanpur) by which
the complain of this petitioner has
been rejected considering the earlier*



order dated 3.7.2021 in connection with the Case No.375 of 2019 (Arti Kumari Vs. C.D.P.O.).

The petitioner further prays for quashing of order dated 17.5.2023 passed in Appeal Case No.103/2022 by the District Magistrate, Samastipur, however both orders are non-speaking and without considering the material available on record and without verifying the records from the Office of Sanskrit Shiksha Board about genuineness of the certificate of the private respondent.

The petitioner further prays for issuance of direction to the respective respondent to issue appointment letter in favour of the petitioner after setting aside the appointment of private respondent with all consequential benefits.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks not to press the present writ petition, however, seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to avail such other alternative remedies as are otherwise available under the law, including that of filing a suit before the Ld. Civil Court having competent jurisdiction, for redressal of the aforesaid grievances. Liberty, so sought, is



granted.

3. The writ petition stands dismissed as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--

