

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17300 of 2024

Aravind Kumar Son of Late Ramshankar Sinha Resident of village-
Chakchuhar, PO- Sehan, PS- Chehrakalan, Baghi, District- Vaishali, presently
posted as Assistant Teacher, G.M.S. Chapaith, PO- Sehan, PS- Chehrakalan,
Block and PS- Chehrakalan. District- Vaishali, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Addl. Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Addl. Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar. Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Department of Education Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Vaishali, Hajipur.
5. The District Programme Officer (Estab.). Vaishali, Hajipur.
6. The Block Education Officer, Cherakala, Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Ambastha, SC-26
		Mr. Subodh Kumar, AC to SC-26

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 12-12-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned AC to SC-26 for the State.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that the instant writ application has been filed
seeking a direction upon the respondent no. 5 to add the name of
the petitioner at an appropriate place in the seniority list issued
by the respondent no. 5 on 09.02.2014 contained in letter no.
902/Estb.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State
submits that petitioner is seeking a writ of mandamus for



directing the authorities to add the name of the petitioner at an appropriate place in the seniority list which was published on 09.02.2014 but then it appears that petitioner has rushed to this Court before approaching the authorities raising his grievance as raised in the instant writ application. It is further submitted that basic principle of writ of mandamus is demand and refusal.

4. Since petitioner has not represented before the concerned authority seeking redressal of his grievance and has rushed to this Court directly, as such, the writ application should not be entertained.

5. The Court is in complete concurrence with the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State and, thus, finds no merit in the instant writ application.

6. The writ application is dismissed.

7. However, the same would not preclude the petitioner from approaching the authorities for redressal of his grievance as raised in the instant writ application.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

