

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17910 of 2024

=====

Sujata Kumari W/o Sri Bindi Yadav, R/o-Harlikhurd, P.S.-Bodh Gaya,
District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Education Officer, Gaya.
5. The District Programme Officer (Estt.), District-Gaya.
6. The Block Development Officer, Block-Bodh Gaya, District-Gaya.
7. The Block Education Officer, Block-Bodh Gaya, District-Gaya.
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Kanhoul, Block-Bodh Gaya, District-Gaya.
9. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Kanhoul, Block-Bodh Gaya, District-Gaya.
10. Rinku Kumari D/o Sri Rajendra Prasad Yadav, R/o Vill-Lahara, P.S.-Bodh Gaya, District-Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, AC to GP-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 06-02-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned AC to GP-4 for the State.
2. Learned AC to GP-4 submits that petitioner has rushed to this Court without availing her alternative remedy before the State Appellate Authority.



3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, thus, submits that when alternative remedy of appeal against the order impugned in the instant writ application is available to the petitioner, there was absolutely no occasion for the petitioner to rush to this Court as she had rushed earlier also and was relegated to the State Appellate Authority as would manifest from Annexure-14 to the writ application.

4. The learned State counsel next submits that the petitioner is assailing the order passed by the District Appellate Authority against which petitioner has remedy of filing appeal before the State Appellate Authority, but then without exhausting the said remedy, the petitioner has filed the instant writ application.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the said submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, as such, the Court is not inclined to entertain the writ application.

6. The writ application is dismissed.

7. However, the same would not preclude the petitioner from availing her remedy of appeal before the State Appellate Authority.

8. It goes without saying that if any appeal is filed



by the petitioner and the issue of limitation arises, the learned State Appellate Authority shall keep in mind that petitioner was pursuing her remedy before this Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

