

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6364 of 2020

=====

Rang Bahadur Pandey Son of Late Ram Janam Pandey, Resident of Village-Kothuwan, P.S.-Karghar, District-Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary of the Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Education Officer, Rohtas (Sasaram).
3. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Rohtas (Sasaram).
4. The Block Development Officer, Kochas, District-Rohtas.
5. The Block Education Officer, Kochas, District-Rohtas.
6. The Panchayat Secretary-cum-Secretary of the Gram Panchayat Teachers Employment Unit, Agarsi Dihara, P.S.-Karghar, District-Rohtas (Sasaram).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajendera Narayan, Sr. Advocate Mr. Omkar Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Kameshwar Kumar, (GP 17)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 17-02-2025 Heard Mr. Rajendera Narayan, learned Senior counsel, along with Mr. Omkar Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Kameshwar Kumar, learned GP 17 appearing on behalf of the State.

2. Mr. Rajendera Narayan, learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that vide order contained in Memo No.12 dated 28.07.2007, Mukhiya and Panchayat Secretary of the Gram Panchayat, Agarsi Dihra had cancelled the appointment of the petitioner, who was appointed on the post of Siksha-Mitra/Panchayat Sikshak, on the ground of



fake mark-sheet, and the same was cancelled by the District Education Appellate Authority vide order dated 12.03.2010 contained in Letter No.98 (Annexure – 10 to the writ petition). He further submitted that the order contained in Letter No.98 dated 12.03.2010 has not been modified by the learned Single Judge in CWJC No.19731 of 2014, which was disposed of on 06.08.2018, by which the District Programme Officer (Establishment), Rohtas (Sasaram) was directed to verify the certificate of the petitioner and if after verification, within the time frame, as indicated in the order, it is found genuine then it shall be obligation of the District Programme Officer (Establishment), Rohtas (Sasaram) to see that the entire payment admissible to the petitioner, on account of order passed by the Appellate Authority, be paid within a further period of one month from the date of such decision. He further submitted that the petitioner is still in service and he is discharging his duty, however, he is aggrieved for non-payment of his due salary, inspite of the specific order passed by the District Appellate Authority, which has not been challenged by the State or by the private respondent till date.

3. Learned Senior counsel further submitted that the petitioner seeks to avail appropriate remedy before appropriate



forum for redressal of his grievances.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

(Purnendu Singh, J.)

Ashishsingh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

