

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1221 of 2025

Arvind Kumar Singh son of Late Gupteshwar Singh, Resident of New Area,
Near Dr. Ramashish Singh, P.S.-Aurangabad Town, District-Aurangabad,
Bihar-824101.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Magadh University through the Registrar, Magadh University, Bodhgaya.
3. The Registrar, Magadh University, Bodhgaya.
4. The Additional Secretary, Rajbhawan Sachivalaya, Bihar, Rajbhavan, Patna.
5. The Ad-hoc Committee through the Secretary, Thakur Brahmadev Sinha Janta College, Akauna, Goh, Aurangabad, Bihar.
6. The President, Ad-hoc Committee Thakur Brahmadev Sinha Janta College, Akauna, Goh, Aurangabad, Bihar.
7. Shri Narendra Kumar, the Secretary, Ad-hoc Committee Thakur Brahmadev Sinha Janta College, Akauna, Goh, Aurangabad, Bihar.
8. Dr. Vinod Kumar Singh, Professor, Department of Zoology, Thakur Brahmadev Sinha Janta College, Akauna, Goh, Aurangabad, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shekhar Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Avinash Kumar Singh, Adv. Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Sarvesh Kumar, GP-24
For the Res. No. 7-8	:	Mr. P N Shahi, Sr. Adv. Mr. Amit Anand, Adv. Ms. Deeksha Singh, Adv. Mr. Pushkar Prabhat, Adv. Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Chancellor	:	Mr. Amish Kumar, Adv. Mr. R K Giri, Adv.
For the University	:	Mr. Siddharth Prasad, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 09-02-2026

At the outset, Mr. Sumit Kumar, learned Advocate for the petitioner seeks permission to make the Secretary of the governing body of the College as a party respondent no. 9.

2. Permission is accorded.



3. Let the same be done in course of the day.

4. Heard Mr. Shekhar Singh, learned Senior Advocate with Mr. Sumit Kumar, learned Advocate for the petitioner. The University is represented through Mr. Siddharth Prasad, learned Advocate. The respondent nos. 7-8 are represented through Mr. P N Shahi, learned Senior Advocate with Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, learned Advocate. Mr. Amish Kumar, learned Advocate representing the learned Chancellor of the University.

5. The petitioner is aggrieved with the order contained in letter bearing No. GIIIA/01/25 dated 09.01.2025, issued under the signature of the Registrar, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya in pursuance to the order of the Vice Chancellor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya; whereby the respondent no. 8 has been appointed as In-charge Principal of the College, in question, in anticipation of meeting of the Ad-hoc Committee and further the appointment of the petitioner as In-charge Principal has been cancelled.

6. Drawing the attention of this Court to the impugned order, it is vehemently contended by learned Senior Advocate for the petitioner that the petitioner has been removed from the post of In-charge Principal by making certain allegation and, as such, the impugned order is stigmatic in nature, nonetheless, the petitioner has been deprived from any opportunity of



hearing before passing the order and, as such, the same is said to be in complete violation of the principles of natural justice.

7. Mr. P N Shahi, learned Senior Advocate representing the respondent nos. 7-8 interjected at this position and submitted that now the regular governing body has been duly constituted in compliance with the order passed by this Court in CWJC No. 11573 of 2023 by the order of the Vice Chancellor, as contained in Memo No. GIHA/220/25 dated 11.12.2025. Once the regular governing body has been constituted, if the petitioner is aggrieved with the action of the Ad-hoc Committee or by the author of the impugned order i.e. Secretary of the Ad-hoc Committee, he may approach before the duly constituted regular governing body, bringing on record the entire facts and the points raised before this Court. The petitioner has also an alternative remedy, as stipulated under the Bihar State Teaching Institutions Teachers and Employees (Disputes, Redressal and Appeal) Rules, 2020 especially in terms of Clause 13(VII) of the Rules, 2020.

8. Mr. Siddharth Prasad, learned Advocate for the University also acknowledged the aforesaid facts and submitted that since the dispute is with regard to appointment of In-charge Principal of an affiliated college, the same is required to be resolved by the regular governing body and if the petitioner is



not satisfied by the order of the governing body, he has the remedy to approach before the syndicate of the University.

9. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned Senior Advocate/learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the nature of the dispute, this Court does not find any reason or occasion to entertain the present writ petition and direct the petitioner to approach before the regular governing body by filing a detailed representation, bringing on record all the facts and the grounds, *inter alia*, the order is in complete disregard and violation of the principle of natural justice.

10. In case such an application/representation is filed before the regular constituted governing body, it is expected that the newly constituted governing body shall look into the matter and pass an appropriate order, after giving opportunity of hearing to all the stake holders, within a period of six weeks, from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

11. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	11.02.2026
Transmission Date	NA

