

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12920 of 2025

=====

Sudha Trivedy, Wife of Sri Siyaram Pandey, resident of E/105, Pushpanjali Vihar Apartment, Saristabad, P.S. - Gardanibagh, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, (Higher Education) Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, (Primary Education) Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Deputy Director, Higher Secondary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
6. The District Education Officer, Vaishali.
7. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Vaishali.
8. The District Education Officer, Patna.
9. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Siyaram Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (06)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 22-09-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents, particularly, respondent nos. 2 and 4, to consider her representation for transfer from the present place of positing i.e. Vaishali district to Patna district, as per the policy decision of the State and as per the choice given by the petitioner on *E-*



Shikshakosh on 11.12.2024.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had submitted her detailed representation for her transfer on the ground of distance as well as illness of her husband, but till date the petitioner has not been transferred to a suitable place and the authorities are sitting tight over the matter.

4. It is also the case of the petitioner that other identically situated persons approached before the concerned authorities and their cases for transfer have been considered positively, but discrimination has been caused to the petitioner.

5. A supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioner bringing on record that the posts are still vacant where the petitioner can be adjusted, this aspect has also not been looked into by the respondents.

6. Learned Advocate for the State submitted that for redressal of the grievance, the petitioner has already filed detailed representations, the copies of which are marked as Annexure-P/5 Series and the same shall be considered by the concerned authorities in accordance with law.

7. Having considered the nature of the grievance and the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the



respective parties, this Court deems it fit and proper to dispose of the present application with a direction to respondent nos. 2 and 4 to consider the representations of the petitioner in the light of the policy decision, which governs her claim and to bring its logical conclusion, as early as possible within six weeks.

8. With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	23.09.2025
Transmission Date	

