

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7312 of 2026

-
-
1. The Union of India through the Director General, Department of Post, Dak Bhawan, New Delhi- 110001.
 2. The Chief Post Master General, Bihar Circle, GPO Complex, Patna- 800001.
 3. The Post Master General, Eastern Region, Bhagalpur- 812001.
 4. The Director of Postal Services, Eastern Region, Bhagalpur- 812001.
 5. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Saharsa Postal Division, Saharsa- 852201.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

Nikhil Kumar, Son of Amal Kishore Singh, Resident of Village Pansalwa, Post Office Pansalwa, Police Station Beldour, District Khagaria and now dismissed from the post of GDSBPM, T. Bargoan, B.O a/c SA Nagar S.O, Saharsa- 852161.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Dr. K.N. Singh, ASG
Mr. Kumar Ravish, CGC
Mr. Rohit Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANA VIKRAM SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH)

Date : 14-07-2026

The present writ petition has been filed challenging the
order dated 13.12.2025, passed by the learned Central



Administrative Tribunal, Patna Bench, Patna (hereinafter referred to as the “learned CAT”) in O.A. No. 050/00865/2024, whereby and whereunder the O.A. has been allowed with the following directions:-

(i) The Dismissal Order, i.e., Memo No. A-355/CH-I/L dated 19.09.2022 (Annexure-A/6), Appellate Order, i.e. Memo No. Vig./ER/Appeal/N. Kumar/SHS2022 dated 30.01.2024 (Annexure-A/8) and Revisional Order, i.e. Memo No. Vig./ER/RP/GDS/Nikhil Kumar/SHS/2024 dt. 26.08.2024 (Annexure-A/10) are quashed and set aside;

(ii) As a consequence the applicant is to be reinstated with consequential relief to be decided by the respondents as per the law and procedure for this intervening period that is from the dismissal to the reinstatement. The respondents are at liberty to complete the inquiry by suitably modifying the list of witnesses and affording the applicant an opportunity to cross examine the author/signatory to the very basis of the charge leveled against him mentioned at point (b) above.

2. We may at the inception note that since we do not intend to interfere with the impugned order dated 13.12.2025, no notice is being issued to the sole respondent.

3. At the very outset, Dr. K.N. Singh, the learned Additional Solicitor General for the Union of India, who is appearing in the present case for the petitioners, has submitted



that now the petitioners do not intend to assail the impugned order dated 13.12.2025, however they are seeking a clarification regarding the observations made in paragraph No. 6 (a) & (b) of the impugned order which are not factually totally correct as would be apparent from a bare perusal of the documents referred to therein, which form part of the written statement filed by the petitioners herein before the learned CAT and have been placed at running page Nos. 168 to 170 of the brief.

4. It is submitted by the learned Additional Solicitor General that the Superintendent of Post Offices, Saharsa Dn., Saharsa had written a letter dated 05.10.2016 to the Secretary, Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna (Bihar) regarding re-verification of mark-sheets of 15 persons, including the respondent herein, who were engaged on the post of GDS. In response to the said letter dated 05.10.2016, the Examination Controller, Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna (Bihar) *vide* letter dated 14.05.2018, while enclosing a list of 15 candidates, had informed the Superintendent of Post Offices, Saharsa Dn., Saharsa that as far as the candidates listed at serial Nos. 01 to 08 of the said list are concerned, the mark-sheets have been found to be uniform while the mark-sheets of the candidates named at serial Nos. 09 to 15, including that of the sole respondent herein,



have not been issued by the Board’s Office.

5. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned Additional Solicitor General, we are of the considered opinion that the contents of any document cannot be altered by any observation made in a judicial order and the same is not only required to be considered on its own face value by the Inquiry Officer but is also required to be proved by examining a competent witness by adhering to the rules of evidence.

6. In light of the aforesaid, the present writ petition stands disposed off as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

(Rana Vikram Singh, J)

Praveen-II/Rakesh

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	16.07.2026
Transmission Date	N/A

