

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10605 of 2026

=====

Jwala Prasad S/o Baldeo Mandal, Resident of Bauliya, Shahpur, Bauliya, P.S.-
Nauhatta, District- Rohtas and presently residing at Pathra South, Ward No.-
10, P.S.- Pipra, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department,
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director of Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Accountant General, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram.
5. The District Programme Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas.
6. The District Superintendent of Education, Rohtas.
7. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Sasaram, Rohtas.
8. The Block Education Extension Officer, Rohtas.
9. The Headmaster, Baulia High School, Baulia, P.S.- Navhatta Dih, District-
Rohtas, Sasaram.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shambhu Sharan Singh
For the Respondent/s	:	Dr. Anand Kumar, Adv.
		Mr. Kanya Thakur, Adv.
		Mr. Prabhat Ranjan, AC to GP6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 27-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The instant writ application has been filed for the
following relief:-

*“1 (i) For payment of admitted retiral dues
rest with the authority concern uptill now including
the third MACP of the petitioner withheld and return
from consideration malafidely by the Accountant
General, Bihar, Patna.*

(ii) For the other consequential relief or



reliefs to the petitioner for which the petitioner is entitled to as per service book of the Govt. of Bihar.

(iii) For other relief or reliefs as your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice to the matter.”

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed as a history teacher temporarily on 30.07.1997 in the pay-scale of 850-30-1270-E.B.-30-1360 and got appointment vide Memo No. 6063-6738 Ni dated 05.10.1987.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner was granted due increments on different dates but, the benefits, which is applicable in the case of the petitioner for grant of second and third Modified Assured Career Progression Scheme (in short ‘MACP’) has not been extended, while the case of other similarly situated persons have been considered and they have been extended the same benefits.

5. On the other hand, counsel for the State submits that necessary directions may be issued and, in case, the petitioner is found entitled to such benefits in the MACP, in such event, the matter may be placed before the Screening Committee and necessary decisions may be directed to be taken in accordance with law.

6. Considering the fact that the benefits under the



MACP as per averments made in the writ application has not been extended to the petitioner while other similarly situated persons have been benefited with such scheme, the petitioner is directed to file detailed representation within a period of four weeks from today with all necessary documents and the parity being pleaded by the petitioner by giving details of all such similarly situated persons. In case, such details are pressed before the competent authority, necessary decision shall be taken by the person competent in law within a period of three months from the date of placing the case before the appropriate Committee who is entrusted to deal with such Scheme.

7. With the aforementioned observation and direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

rishi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

