

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17240 of 2022

=====

Manoj Kumar Son of Punit Mochi, Resident of Village- Bauwan, Police Station- Sigori, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Education Officer, Jehanabad.
4. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Jehanabad.
5. The Block Education Officer, Faridpur, Jehanabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 13-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The present writ application has been filed for issuance of a direction to the Respondent No.5 to pay the arrears of salary as well as current salary of the petitioner, although he is working as Panchayat Teacher in Primary School Bisunpura in Panchayat Sohraya, District- Jehanabad and for that petitioner has filed representation before Respondent No.5 but no heed was paid by authority and/or pass such appropriate order or orders as deem fit and proper.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after going through the averments made in the writ application, it



would be deem fit and proper to direct the petitioner to file a detailed representation before Respondent No.4 within a period of one month from today and after receiving such representation, the Respondent No. 4 would pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law within a period of two months thereafter after affording proper opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

4. It is an admitted fact that the petitioner has worked from the year 2015 to 2018 but it is alleged by learned counsel for the State that the certificate of the petitioner is not genuine and he has not submitted his certificate for verification before the concerned authority. Hence, the payment was not made.

5. While considering the representation of the petitioner passing the order, Respondent No.4 is well advised to consider the fact that the petitioner has worked from the year 2015 to 2018 but no payment has been made for that period.

6. It is made clear that this Court may take serious view of the matter if the order is not complied within the stipulated period as aforesaid.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

priyanka/-

U			
---	--	--	--

