

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2588 of 2026

=====

Sangita Kumari Wife of Uttam Kumar, Resident of Mohalla- Uttam Kutir
Gali No.- 8, village- Barahpathhar Dehri, P.S- Dehri, District- Rohtas at
Sasaram, Bihar, PIN No.- 821307.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Kishanganj.
2. The District Education Officer, Kishanganj.
3. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Kishanganj.
4. The District Education Officer, Patna.
5. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Patna.
6. The Block Education Officer, Dighalbank, District- Kishanganj.
7. The Headmaster, Upgraded Middle School, Lakshmipur Gurj Tola,
Dighalbank, District- Kishanganj.
8. The Block Education Officer, Dhanarua, District- Patna.
9. The Headmaster, Primary School, Rasalpur, Dhanarua District- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr. U.S.S. Singh, Government Pleader (19)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondent-State.

2. During the course of argument, learned counsel for
the petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to paragraph nos.
36 and 37 of the writ application, which is quoted hereinbelow
for needful:

*“37. That on the application of the
petitioner the District Public Grievance
Redressal Cell has passed an order on
20.09.2025 and stated that this is the matter
of appointment and not under the purview of*



Public Grievance Redressal Cell so her application was dismissed with a liberty to file an application before the appropriate authority.

38. That vide letter No. 1685 dated 04.10.2025 the District Programme Officer (Establishment), Kishanganj has wrote a letter /informed to the District Public Grievance Redressal Cell, Kishanganj stating therein that as the petitioner was absent for a long time about 13 years so as per Rule 236(198) of Bihar Service Code the petitioner is not entitled to her joining.”

3. In view of the submission made by the petitioner in paragraph no. 37 of the writ application wherein the petitioner has admitted that the application filed by the petitioner before the District Public Grievance Redressal Cell stood rejected on 29.09.2025 granting liberty to the petitioner to file an application before the appropriate authority, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw this writ application with liberty to file an application before the appropriate authority in terms of order dated 20.09.2025 said to have been passed by the District Public Grievance Redressal Cell.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State



does not have any objection to the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Although in paragraph no. 37 of the writ application, it has been stated by the petitioner that the application of the petitioner was dismissed by the District Public Grievance Redressal Cell on 20.09.2025 granting liberty to the petitioner to file an application before the appropriate authority, the order dated 20.09.2025 has not been brought on record. However, taking note of the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that such an order exists granting the petitioner liberty to file an application before the appropriate authority, the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is accepted and the present writ application is dismissed as withdrawn granting liberty to the petitioner to file an application before the appropriate authority if such a liberty has been granted by order dated 20.09.2025 passed by the District Public Grievance Redressal Cell.

6. Accordingly, the present writ application stands dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as aforesaid.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kiran/-

U			
---	--	--	--

