

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24059 of 2018

=====

Mukesh Kumar Pankaj Son of Ashrafi Yadav, Vill/P.O.- Banshgopal,
P.S./Block- Puraini, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Madhepura.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Madhepura.
5. The District Superintendent of Education/The District Programme Officer Establishment, Madhepura.
6. The Block Development Officer, Puraini, District-Madhepura
7. The Block Education Extension Officer, Puraini, District- Madhepura
8. Teachers Selection Unit, Gram Panchayat Taj, Banshgopal, P.O-
Banshgopal, P.S.- Puraini, Distict-Ma
9. Mukhia, Gram Panchayat Raj, Panchgopal, P.O.- Banshgopal, P.S.- Puraini,
District- Madhepura.
10. The District Teachers Selection Appellate Authority, Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sidhendra Narayan Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kameshwar Kumar- GP17
AC to GP-17

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 01-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned AC to GP-17.

2. The Court has perused the order passed by the
District Appellate Authority and the State Appellate Authority. The
case of the petitioner was dismissed by the District Appellate
Authority and the State Appellate Authority by an order dated 17-
7-2010 (Annexure-9) and 17-7-2018 (Annexure-10) respectively.



From perusal of the order dated 17-7-2010 passed by the District Appellate Authority in Appeal No. 79 of 2009, it would manifest that petitioner had moved before the authority seeking his salary for the period, he was claiming that he had worked, but then the contention of the petitioner was rejected by the authority on the ground that petitioner was not able to produce any document to show that after his extension of service from 1-2-2003 to 31-5-2004, again his service was extended, further the petitioner was also absent from the school from 1-6-2004 to 30-4-2006.

3. Being aggrieved by the order dated 17-1-2010 passed by the District Appellate Authority, the petitioner moved before the State Appellate Authority and the State Appellate Authority also affirmed the order of the District Appellate Authority by its order dated 17-7-2018 in Appeal Case No. 240 of 2018. The State Appellate Authority also concurred with the findings of the District Appellate Authority that the petitioner was absent from the school continuously, as such, his service was discontinued as Panchayat Teacher.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner now submits that petitioner is not seeking his salary but he would be satisfied in the event if a direction is issued to the authority for considering the case of the petitioner for appointment as Panchayat Teacher.

5. The Court is not inclined to accept the submission



made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and finds no infirmity in the order dated 17-7-2010 passed by the District Appellate Authority (Annexure-9) and the order dated 17-7-2018 passed by the State Appellate Authority (Annexure-10), as such, the writ application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

