

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.186 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2146 of 2013

=====

Kumari Indrakala Sinha Wife of Harishankar Prasad Singh, Resident of
Village-Imadpur, P.O. Imadpur, P.S. Bhagwanpur, District Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Mr. R. K. Mahajan, The Commissioner Cum Secretary Department Of Education
2. Mr. M. Ram Chandra , The Director Primary Education Department of Education Govt. of Bihar New Secr
3. Mrs Rachna Patil, the District Magistrate, Vaishali
4. Mr. Satyanaryan Prasad, The District Education Officer, Vaishali.
5. Mr. Mustafa Hussain Ansari, The District Programme Officer Establishment Vaishali
6. Mr. Narendra Prasad, the Block Development Officer, Bhagwanpur, District Vaishali
7. Dr. Ranjana The Block Education Officer, Bhagwanpur, Vaishali

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sri Krishna Ranjan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey, Aag15
Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, AC to Aag- 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NANI TAGIA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-07-2025 This contempt petition has been filed alleging

violation of order dated 10.07.2013 passed in CWJC No. 2146 of

2013, wherein, this Court had passed the following order:-

*“This Court would, accordingly, remit
the matter back to the Director, Primary Education
to examine with regard to validity of the degree
awarded by Seva Bharti Adhyapan Mandir
Sevapuri, Varanasi and to that extent also re-
examine his own decision, contained in letter no.
622 dated 12.9.2012, as contained in Annexure 15.*



The petitioners, therefore, may approach the office of the Director, Primary Education by filing their individual representation, whereafter the Director, Primary Education shall consider the individual case of the petitioners as with regard to validity of their qualification acquired by them in the year 1988- 90, 1993-95 and 1995-97 in terms of 2006 Rules for appointment on the post of teacher. The Director, Primary Education, must take his decision expeditiously preferably within a period of four months from the date of filing of the individual and separate representation by the petitioners.

It also goes without saying that if the order of termination of the petitioner no.1 is found to be bad by the Director, Primary Education on account of fulfilment of her qualification she will be entitled for her reinstatement with back wages but in case her degree or for that purpose qualification acquired by all the three petitioners are found to be ineligible, their services shall stand terminated.

With the aforementioned observation and direction, this application is disposed of.”

2. Opposite party No. 2 has filed a show cause, wherein, in paragraph No. 3 it has been stated as under:-

“3. That in the present context it is most respectfully submitted that it was soon after having come to know of the present case, that steps had duly been undertaken to comply with the direction



given by the Hon'ble Court in the connected writ application and it is accordingly that the aforesaid direction of this Hon'ble Court has been carried out in its letter and spirit in as much as a speaking order has been passed vide memo No. 761 dated 01.08.2017 wherein the issue as directed by this Hon'ble Court has duly been decided. The Photostat copy of the said order dated 01.08.2017 have been issued to all concerned including the petitioner.

The Photostat copy of the order contained in memo No. 761 dated 01.08.2017 is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure-A to this show cause”

3. A photocopy of the order contained in Memo No. 761 dated 01.08.2017 has been enclosed as Annexure – A to the contempt petition. In view of the above, I find that the order dated 10.07.2013 passed in CWJC No. 2146 of 2013 has been duly complied with by the respondents.

4. In view of the above, this contempt application stands closed and disposed of.

(Nani Tagia, J)

Siddharth
Sagar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

