

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5476 of 2026

=====

Ranjay Kumar S/O- Panchdeo Prasad, R/O- Vill.- Banjari, Ward No.-12, P.O.-
Gopalganj, P.S.- Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj. Petitioner/s
Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Director, Secondary Education, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Deputy Secretary to the Director, Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
4. The Regional Education Deputy Director, Saran at Chhapra.
5. The District Education Officer, Siwan.
6. The District Education Officer, Gopalganj.
7. The District Programmer Officer (Establishment), Siwan.
8. The District Programmer Officer, Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Adesh Raj, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. U.S.S. Singh, GP-19

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 17-04-2026

Heard the parties.

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

- (a) *For issuance of a writ of mandamus for direction to the respondents to transfer the petitioner from the office of the respondent no. 5, D.E.O., Siwan to the office of the respondent of the 6 or 8 at Gopalganj on the ground that his mother is a bad ridden aged lady suffering from several chronic deceases and also her treatment is going on under the Doctors M/S Dharamshila Narayana Super Specialty Hospital, New Dehi and she requires diagnozin with*



regular check-ups Dylanin. and Secondary, there is not any male person at home, Gopalganj who can take care of his mother. She requires constant care and assistance.

(b) Further pleased to direct the respondents to consider and dispose of the petitioner's representation in a time-bound manner by passing a reasoned order. Declaring the action of the respondents as arbitrary and discriminatory.

(c) And also be further pleased to restrain the respondents from making further transfers ignoring the petitioner's claim.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that mother of the petitioner is suffering from multiple old age ailments and is under continuous treatment at Narayana Health Centre, New Delhi. Since he is the only son, who is responsible for attending his mother's medical needs and his presence at Gopalganj is indispensable. The petitioner submitted a detailed representation on 12.07.2025, 28.07.2025, 21.08.2025 and 23.10.2025, requesting transfer to his hometown on medical and compassionate grounds, but the same has not been considered by the respondent-authorities. It is further contended on behalf of the petitioner that in a similar circumstance one Dhiraj Kumar has been transferred, ignoring the claim of the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner is the only son and his mother is suffering



from old age ailments and is under treatment at Delhi, therefore, it is not possible for him to attend to his mother's day to day needs.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel for the State submits that distance between Gopalganj and Siwan is not more than 40-50 kilometers and it is not the case of the petitioner that his mother is being treated at Gopalganj and therefore his presence is required at Gopalganj at all the time for her treatment. It has further been submitted that transfer is not a routine matter, rather it is the policy decision of the State Government and it can't be issued on request of any individual employee at their request.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the records, it appears that the mother of the petitioner is being treated at New Delhi and the distance between the Gopalganj to Siwan is not more than 40-50 kilometers, the petitioner can attend his office at Siwan, even by residing at his hometown of Gopalganj or he can take his mother to Siwan along with him so that he can take care of his mother. Further transfer order cannot be issued only on the request made by any employee in a routine manner.

7. Accordingly, I do not find any merit in the writ



petition and the same is dismissed.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

AjayMishra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

