

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17022 of 2023

-
1. Birendra Prasad, Son of Lal Bahadur Prasad, Resident of village- Kachorwa, P.O. and P.S.- Adapur, District-East Champaran.
 2. Arvind Kumar Singh, Son of Shiv Mangal Singh, Resident of village and P.O.- Padumakar, P.S.- Patahi via Pachpakri, District-East Champaran.
 3. Ranjit Kumar Rao, Son of Ista Chanpatiya Dev Rao, Resident of Village-Mushari, P.S- Chanpatiya, District-West Champaran.
 4. Devendra Pandey, Son of Mukti Nath Pandey, Resident of Village- Gokhula, P.O.-Siswa, P.S. Banjaria, District-East Champaran.
 5. Surendra Rai, Son of Birendra Rai, resident of Mohalla- Ward No.8, Near to Mujib Giri High School, Miskant Ramana, P.S.- Motihari, District-East Champaran.
 6. Ajablal Rai, Son of Ram Bahadur Rai, resident of village- Gamharia, P.O.- Narayanpur, District- East Champaran.
 7. Dinesh Tiwari, Son of Sri Ram Tiwari, resident of village- Siswa Tola, P.O.- Gokhula Siswa, District-East Champaran.
 8. Subodh Kumar, son of Babulal Prasad, resident of village- Amba, PS- Banjariya, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Commissioner-cum-Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, Mass Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Education Officer, East Champaran.
6. The District Education Officer, West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Madanjeet Kumar, GP- 20

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2025 Heard the parties.

2. At the outset, Mr. Sanjay Kumar, learned Advocate



for the petitioners submits that in view of the decision rendered in Civil Review No. 59 of 2018, the present writ petition has become infructuous and, as such, he seeks permission to withdraw the same.

3. Learned Advocate for the State has no objection.

4. In view thereof, the present writ petition stands dismissed, as having become infructuous.

(Harish Kumar, J)

uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--

