

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16069 of 2013

=====

Saraswati Devi W/O Parshuram Singh Mukhia, Gram Panchayat Raj Bishun
Pur, Barari, P.S.- Barari, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Education, Government Of Bihar,
Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Katihar
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Katihar
5. The District Education Officer, Katihar
6. The District Program Officer, Katihar
7. The Block Education Extension Officer, Block- Barari, District- Katihar
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Raj Bishun Pur, Null Block-
Barari, District- Katihar
9. Sri Mukesh Kumar Yadav S/O Not Known Panchayat Teacher, Primary
School, Dhenua Barari Under Panchayat Raj Bishun Pur, Block- Barari,
District- Katihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raghvendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Ajay Bihari Sinha, G.A.-8.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 09-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner has filed this writ application for
issuance of a appropriate writ/ direction to the respondent
authorities to take action and terminate to Sri Mukesh Kumar
Yadav who is illegally working as pnachayat teacher in Primary
School, Dhenua (Barari) under Panchayat Raj Bishunpur, P.S.
Barari, District-katihar and direction to respondent authorities to



recover the salary amount which was illegally withdrawn by the respondent No.9, Sri Mukesh Kr. Yadav.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that from paragraph 6 to 9 of the counter affidavit filed by respondent-State, it shall be clear that the respondent State has already initiated action against Sri Mukesh Kumar Yadav and, therefore, the grievance of the petitioner already stands redressed. Paragraph No.6 to 9 of the counter affidavit filed by respondent-State is quoted hereinbelow for needful :-

“6. That it is stated that so far as the present status is concerned, Mukesh Yadav now Block Teacher, upgraded M.S. Dhenua, Block Barari has been suspended vide B.D.O. Barari Memo No.35 dated 12.01.2017 and a departmental proceeding has already been initiated against him.

7. That it is stated that B.D.O. Barari was also directed vide letter no.255 dated 09.02.2017 to recover Rs. 2250/- paid to him during jail period with interest.

8. That it is stated that vide D.O.O. (Establishment) letter No.550 dated 09.03.2017 the B.D.O. Barari was directed to recover the paid amount with interest. The matter is also under investigation by Hon'ble Lokayukt, Bihar.

9. That in view of statement made hereinbelow it is evident that the department is taking due action and as such this writ application is fit to be rejected.”

4. From the aforesaid statement made by respondent-State, it is absolutely clear that the grievance of the petitioner has already been redressed by the respondent-State and, therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served in continuing



with the present writ application.

5. Accordingly, this writ application is disposed of in
light of the aforesaid statement made by respondent-State.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

