

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17866 of 2023

Rijala Khatoon daughter of Mohamadin Ansari, resident of Village and P.O. Bahdinpur, P.s. Paroo, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Patna, Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Patna, Bihar.
3. The Director, Education Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Education Officer, Education Department, Muzaffarpur.
6. The District Program Officer, Literacy, Education Department, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Block Education Officer of Paroo, Muzaffarpur.
8. Head Master cum Chair Person of Upgraded Middle School, Mukundpur, Bahdinpur.
9. The Secretary cum Member of Selection Committee of Upgraded Middle School Mukundpur, Bahdinpur, P.s.-Paroo, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yugal Kishore
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Standing Counsel (13)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-01-2025 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

“For issuance of writ in nature of mandamus and/or an appropriate writ for direction to the respondents to consider the candidature of the petitioner as candidate for talim Markaj teacher for Bahrudin panchayat, tola - Mukundpur, Block Paroo, Distict-Muzaffarpur for the advertisement published in year 2023, as the respondents have wrongly shown that the petitioner is resident of out of Poshan area and also failed to consider that advertisement has published for Bahrudinpur Panchayat not for Tola Mukundpur, and also to issue writ in nature of certiorari to set aside the merit list dated 9/9/2023



issued by member of selection committee (Annexure-P-1) and a direction should be given to the respondents that after considering the candidature of the petitioner a fresh merit list should be published, so that claim of the petitioner could be considered and/ or for passing any other order/ orders, direction/ directions for which the petitioner is legally entitled in the fact and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already filed a representation before the Respondent No. 5, but till date no order has been passed by the Respondent No. 5.

4. Considering the above-mentioned fact, the Respondent No. 5 is directed to consider the case of the petitioner after affording opportunity of personal hearing or through his counsel and pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law within four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

5. With the aforesaid direction, the writ application stands disposed of.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not gone to the merit of the case.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

U			
---	--	--	--

