

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16 of 2023

=====

The Panchayat Secretary-Cum-The Secretary Gram Panchayat Elementary
Teacher Employment Unit, Gauharpur, Block-Konch, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Sheela Kumari Wife of Sanjay Sharma Resident of Village-Barorah, P.O. Tineri, P.S. Guraru, District-Gaya.
2. The State of Bihar The Principal Secrerary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna, Bihar.
3. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna, Bihar.
4. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Education Officer, Gaya.
6. The District Programme Officer (Establishment),Gaya.
7. The Block Development Officer, Konch, Gaya.
8. The Block Education Officer, Konch, Gaya.
9. The Chairman-Cum-the Mukhiya, Employment Unit, Gram Panchayat Raj, Gauharpur, Block-Konch, District-Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rohit Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prabhakar Jha, GP-27

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 11-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The present writ application has been preferred against the order dated 26.07.2022 passed in O.A. No.05/2022 by which the State Appellate Authority, Education Department, Bihar, Patna has quashed the Memo No.1117 dated 11.05.2022 issued under the signature of the District Education Officer, Gaya and letter no.06 dated 19.05.2020 issued under the signature of Panchayat Secretary, Panchayat Teacher



Employment Committee, Gauharpur, Konch, Gaya.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent no.1 was appointed as Panchayat Teacher under Gram Panchayat Gauharpur, Konch, Gaya. In course of scrutiny by the concerned authority, it was found that respondent no.1 has been appointed in violation of the specific provision of 'The Bihar Panchayat Primary Teachers Eligibility Test Rules, 2011'. Thereafter, the respondent no.1 was terminated from the service. Against the termination order, respondent no.1 preferred O.A. No.05 of 2022 before the State Appellate Authority. The said O.A. No.05 of 2022 was allowed with a direction to reinstate her in the employment.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the records as well as the order of the State Appellate Authority, I find no reason to interfere with the order dated 26.07.2022 passed in O.A. No.05 of 2022. State is directed to take action in accordance with law.

5. Accordingly, this writ application stands disposed of.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

