

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4014 of 2025

-
1. Md. Aquil Akhtar S/o Md. Suhail Akhtar, Resident of Mohalla- Kaghzi Mohalla, P.O. and P.S.- Biharsharif, District- Nalanda, Presently working as Headmaster in Middle School Mamurabad, P.O.- Mirchaiganj, Block- Noorsarai, District- Nalanda.
 2. Md. Sami Ahmad, S/o- Md. Ainul Hoda, Resident of At Mahua Tola, P.O. and P.S.- Sohsarai, District- Nalanda, Presently working as Assistant Teacher in Urdu Middle School Asha Nagar, P.O.- Sohsarai, Block- Biharsharif, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its The Additional Chief Secretary cum The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary cum The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Joint Secretary, Education Department, Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Education Officer, Nalanda.
6. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rama Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned GP-14 for the State.

2. Learned GP-14 for the State at the outset submits that the petitioners are seeking a writ of mandamus but then from perusal of the pleadings made in the writ application, it would manifest that the petitioners have rushed to this Court without moving before the authority competent seeking redressal of their grievance as raised in the instant writ



application. It is further submitted that basic principles of issuing a writ of mandamus is demand and refusal but then from perusal of the pleadings made in the writ application, it would manifest that petitioners before moving this Court have not approached the authorities for seeking redressal of their grievance.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners is not in a position to rebut the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, as such, the Court finds no merit in the writ application.

4. Hence, the writ application is dismissed.

5. However, the same would not preclude the petitioners from approaching the authorities for seeking redressal of their grievance as raised in the instant writ application.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

