

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10644 of 2025

Vijay Prasad Singh, Son of Late Bhola Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-
Karpi, P.S.- Karpi, District- Arwal.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Human Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Human Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Additional Secretary, Human Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Director (Secondary Education), Human Resources Department (Education Department), Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Director (Primary Education), Human Resources Department (Education Department), Government of Bihar, Patna.
7. The District Magistrate, District- Arwal.
8. The District Education Officer, District- Arwal.
9. The D.D.C., District- Arwal.
10. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), District- Arwal.
11. The Block Education Officer, Block- Karpi, District- Arwal.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Prasad Singh, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Advocate (07)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 11-09-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner who is said to be a villager of village Karpi, has approached this Court seeking quashing of the office order dated 24.05.2025 under memo quality/647 Arwal (Annexure P/5) whereby the earlier office order no. 437 dated 07.04.2025 has been cancelled by a three members committee and directed for merger of Kanya Middle School, Karpi in +2



High School Karpi on place of Middle School (boys) Karpi. For redressal of the grievance, the villagers alongwith the petitioner has approached before the District Magistrate, Arwal, Bihar as well as District Education Officer, Arwal but to no effect and thus, being authorized by the villagers and the guardians of the student of Kanya Middle School, Karpi, the present writ petition is filed.

3. Learned Advocate for the State made a preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of the writ application on account of lack of *locus standi* of the petitioner.

4. Having considered the submissions set forth and taking note of the fact that the villagers have already approached before the District Magistrate, but no decision has been taken, this Court taking lenient view gives liberty to the petitioner to approach before the respondent District Education Officer, Arwal by filing a further detailed representation, who shall look into the matter and pass appropriate order, in accordance with law.

5. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

