

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.500 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16498 of 2023

=====

Ranjeet Ram @ Ranjit Ram S/O Lalan Ram, Resident of Village Mahua
Khap, P.S. Baikunthpur, District Gopalganj.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Human Resource Development, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. District Education Officer, Gopalganj.
4. District Programme Officer (Estb.) cum Nodal Officer, Vigilance Cell, Gopalganj.
5. Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Raj Dumariya, Block Sidhwalia, District- Gopalganj.
6. Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Raj Dumariya, Block Sidhwalia, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Madhu Prasun, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anjaneya Singh, AC to AAG-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

7 13-07-2026

Re: I.A. No. 01 of 2026

Learned counsel for the appellant presses I.A. No. 01
of 2026 for condoning the delay of 90 days in preferring this
appeal.

2. For the reasons stated in the application, the delay
in preferring this appeal is condoned.

3. I.A. No. 01 of 2026 stands allowed.



Re: L.P.A No. 500 of 2025

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. The present *intra* court appeal is directed against the order dated 18.12.024 passed by learned Single Judge in C.W.J.C No. 16498 of 2023, whereby the writ petition preferred by the appellant came to be disposed of.

6. The writ petition was filed, inter alia, seeking the following reliefs:-

*"I. To quash the order dated 19-07-2023 issued vide Letter No. 12 by Respondent No 6 terminating the services of the petitioner without any show cause, without any Departmental proceeding and without giving any opportunity of being heard in utter violation of the Principle of Natural Justice.
II. To pay the consequential benefits accruing thereto.
III. To any other relief / reliefs for which petitioners are entitled for."*

7. The learned Single Judge while disposing of the writ petition had made the following observations:-

"5. It is settled law that where a right or liability is created by a statute which gives a special remedy for enforcing it, the remedy provided by the statute alone must be availed of. Since, the petitioner has got statutory alternative remedy of filing appeal before the District Appellate Authority under Rule 13 of the Rules, 2020, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter in its



extra-ordinary writ jurisdiction.

6. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of with direction to the petitioner to file an appeal before the concerned District Appellate Authority. In the event, such appeal is filed within six weeks from today, the same shall be disposed of by a reasoned order in accordance with law after hearing the parties."

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon consideration of the materials available on record, this Court is of the considered view that the learned Single Judge has rightly declined to entertain the writ petition in view of the availability of an efficacious statutory remedy of appeal under Rule 13 of the Rules, 2020. It is a settled principle of law that where a statute provides mechanism for redressal of grievances, the writ court would ordinarily refrain from exercising its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution, unless exceptional circumstances are shown to exist. No such exceptional circumstance has been pointed out by the appellant so as to warrant interference with the order passed by the learned Single Judge. We, therefore, find no error or perversity in the impugned order warranting interference in the present intra-court appeal.

9. However, in the interest of justice, the appellant is granted liberty to avail the statutory remedy of appeal, as



indicated by the learned Single Judge, preferably within a period of six weeks from today.

10. In the event such appeal is preferred within the aforesaid period, the appellate authority shall consider and decide the same on its own merits, in accordance with law, after affording due opportunity of hearing to the parties, without being influenced by any observations made in the order of the learned Single Judge or in the present order.

11. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the present intra-court appeal stands disposed of.

12. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Sudhir Singh, ACJ)

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Suruchi/Rajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

