

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2741 of 2025

1. Md. Akhtar Hussain, Son of- Kafiluddin, Resident of village- Bahura ward no.-11 P.O-Baraidgah P.S- Amour District- Purnia. Presently Panchayat Teacher in Primary School Marwa, Bara Istambarar P.S- Jokihat, District- Araria.
2. Md Arshad Akhter @ Arshad Akhter, Son of-Late Md. Sharif, Resident of village- Hakka, ward no.-06 P.O-Baraidgah P.S- Amour District- Purnia. Presently Panchayat teacher in Primary School Pipra, Bara Istambarar P.S- Jokihat, District- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Education Officer Araria, District- Araria.
4. District Programme Officer (Establishment), District- Araria.
5. District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority (District Authority), Araria.
6. Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Bara Istambarar P.S-Jokihat, District- Araria.
7. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Bara Istambarar, P.S- Jokihat, District- Araria.
8. Md. Asgar, Son of-Md Akhtar Hussain, Resident of village- Pipra, P.O- Bara Istambarar P.S- Jokihat District- Araria.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Md. Ziaul Quamar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (24)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 02-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners are aggrieved with the order dated 16.01.2025 passed by the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority, Araria whereby the application of the petitioners to exclude their name from the array of the opposite



party in District Appeal No. 01/2020 filed by the respondent no. 8 came to be rejected.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioners submitted that the claim of the respondent no. 8 has not adverse to the claim of the petitioners and, in fact, they are not the necessary parties, besides the fact that earlier the respondent no. 8 had approached before the State Appellate Authority, where the petitioners were not impleaded as party respondents, but, in order to wreck vengeance and harass, the petitioners have been made respondent nos. 1 and 2 in District Appeal No. 01/2020.

4. Learned Advocate for the State submits at the Bar that from the order impugned it is evident that the petition of the petitioners came to be rejected in order to avoid the multiplicity of litigation. Moreover, the petitioners have statutory remedy of appeal before the State Appellate Authority and this Court ought not to exercise the jurisdiction in the present matter.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the fact the petitioners has appropriate statutory remedy against the order impugned, this Court does not find any reason to entertain the present writ petition; accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed off.



6. However, the petitioners are at liberty to assail the order before the State Appellate Authority, if so advised.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

