

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18531 of 2015**

=====

Noor Naz Begum Wife of Md. Sharif Resident of village - Amdabad, P.S. and  
Block - Amdabad, District - Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority, Katihar.
3. The District Education Officer, Katihar.
4. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Katihar.
5. The Pramukh -Cum- Chairman, Block Teachers Employment Committee, Amdabad, District- Katihar.
6. The Block Development Officer -Cum- Secretary, Block Teachers Employment Committee, Amdabad, District- Katihar.
7. The Block Education Officer, Block- Amdabad, District- Katihar.
8. Sabnam Yasmin, Wife of Abdus Salam Resident of village - Amdabad, P.S. and Block- Amdabad, District- Katihar.
9. The Secretary, Bihar State Madarsa Board, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                       |   |                                                                                |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s  | : | None                                                                           |
| For the Respondent/s  | : | Mr. Sita R. Yadav, GP-16<br>Mr. Rakesh Kumar Shrivastava, AC to GP-16          |
| For the Madarsa Board | : | Md. Shahzad Hassan Khan, Adv.<br>Md. Aslam Ansari, Adv.                        |
| For Respondent No.8   | : | Mr. Prabhakar Singh, Adv.<br>Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.<br>Mr. Pranav Bhaskar, Adv. |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

16    02-12-2025                      No one appears on behalf of the petitioner. Learned counsel appears for Madarsa Board, learned counsel for respondents-State and learned counsel appearing for respondent no.8 are present.

2. By order dated 11.11.2025 this case was adjourned by way of last chance, making it clear that if on the next date



also the petitioner is not interested in pressing the writ application then the Court may consider dismissing it for non-prosecution.

3. Today again when the case is called out, no one appears on behalf of the petitioner to press the writ application.

4. In this view of the matter and in light of previous order dated 11.11.2025 the present writ application is dismissed for non-prosecution.

**(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)**

Prakash Narayan

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

