

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3203 of 2026

=====

Leela Kumari D/o Sukan Ram, Resident of Village- Laukaha, P.S.- Khutauna
District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Madhubani.
4. The District Education Officer, Madhubani.
5. The Block Development Officer, Hutauna, Madhubani.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Phulprash, District- Madhubani.
7. The Block Education Officer, Khutauna.
8. Domani Kumari, D/o Milai Sada, Resident of Village- Bramutra, P.S.- Lokaha, District- Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prafull Chandra Thakur, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (05)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 10-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

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

*(i) That this writ application is
being filed for issuance of a writ preferably
in the nature of mandamus commanding and
directing the Respondent concerned to select
the petitioner on the post of Vikas Mitra
whereby and whereunder authority was*



published for Niyojan of Vikas Mitra and the petitioner possess First position of merit list and 50% disable person.

(ii) And /Or any other relief or reliefs, for which petitioner is found entitled to in the facts and circumstances of this case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has filed a representation before the Block Development Officer, which is annexed as Annexure P/3. He further submits that for redressal of his grievance he has filed the said representation before the Block Development Officer, but no decision has been taken by the Block Development Officer.

4. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner has filed the writ petition for issuance of a writ of mandamus, but he is seeking issuance of mandamus on the representation of other persons and not on his own representation, therefore, he submits that the present writ petition is not maintainable.

5. After hearing the parties and upon perusal of the record, it transpires to this Court that there is substance in the contention raised by the learned counsel for the State. It is true



that the representation has not been filed by the petitioner and, according to law, the representation has to be filed before the Sub-Divisional Officer, Phulprash, District- Madhubani (respondent No. 6).

6. In this view of the matter, the present writ petition is premature and is accordingly disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to file a representation within 30 days before the respondent No. 6 in light of the Vikash Mitra Chayan Margdarshika.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

