IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (S) No. 1782 of 2017
------

1. Indradeo Prasad, S/o late Moti Mahto, R/o Silwar Khurd, P.O. Jagarnath Dham, P.S. Muffasil, District-Hazaribagh.
2. Teju Saw, S/o late Dular Saw, R/o Dinkar Nagar, New Forest Colony, P.O. Hazaribagh, P.S. Sadar, District-Hazaribagh
3. Santosh Kushwaha, S/o late Bhagwan Mahto, R/o Silwar Khurd, P.O. Jagarnath Dham, P.S. Muffasil, District-Hazaribagh.
4. Baby Sabnam, W/o Kumud Ranjan Sinha, R/o Flat No.203, Ganga Jamuna Apartment, back to Skylok Hotel, Hazaribagh, P.O. Hazaribagh, P.S. Hazaribagh Sadar, District Hazaribagh.
5. Madhawi Kumari, D/o Sri Mathura Prasad, R/o Gandhi Nagar, East Lane No.5, P.O. Hazaribagh, P.S. Sadar, District Hazaribagh.
6. Ila Kumari, W/o Sri Santosh Kumar, R/o Old Excise Check Post, Ranchi Patna Road, P.O. & P.S. Sadar Hazaribagh, District-Hazaribagh.
7. Asha Kumari Sah, W/o Sanjay Prasad Choudhary, R/o Shivpuri West near Shiv Mandir, Hazaribagh, P.O. Hazaribagh, P.S. Sadar District Hazaribagh.

... . …. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Department of Education & literacy, having its office at Project Bhawan, H.E.C., Dhurwa, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagannathpur, District Ranchi
3. The Director, Primary Education and Literacy Department, having its office at Project Bhawan, H.E.C., Dhurwa, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagannathpur District Ranchi
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh, P.O., P.S. and District Hazaribagh.
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Hazaribagh, P.O., P.S. and District Hazaribagh.
6. The District Superintendent of Education, Hazaribagh, P.O., P.S. and District Hazaribagh

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Petitioners : None
For the State : Mr. Mithilesh Singh, G.A.-IV

Order No.05/Dated : 29.09.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the State.

2. Nobody appears on behalf of the petitioners.

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

   (i) For issuance of appropriate writ(s), direction(s), and/or order(s), particularly a writ in the nature of Certiorari for

quashing order contained in Memo No. 199 dated 30.1.2017 issued under the signature of Deputy Development Commissioner, Hazaribagh (Respondent No.5) by which Departmental Promotion Committee, Hazaribagh has granted promotion to the post of trained Graduate Teachers (Science & Math.) in Gr. 4 in the pay scale of Rs.9300-34,800/- and posted them at the places mentioned against their names. The said promotion has been granted to the teachers against the provision of Bihar Takeover Elementary School Teachers Promotion Rule, 1993 and also ignoring the legitimate claim of the petitioners;

(ii) For issuance of appropriate writ(s), direction(s), and/or order(s), particularly a writ in the nature of Mandamus commanding upon the respondents to immediately and forthwith consider the case of the petitioner for promotion to Grade-4 post of Teacher in the scale of Rs.9300-34800/-;

(iii) For issuance of appropriate writ(s), direction(s), and/or order(s), for staying the operation of order contained in Memo No. 202 dated 30.1.2017 issued under the signature of Deputy Development Commissioner, Hazaribagh (Respondent No.5);

4. The order dated 02.02.2022 passed by this Court reads as under: -

> *"Heard Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, learned Sr. Counsel assisted by Mr. Abhishek Sinha, appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Mithilesh Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.*
>
> *After some arguments learned Sr. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners seeks time to file Interlocutory Application in order to implead affected persons as parties – respondents.*
>
> *Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents – State does not object to the prayer.*
>
> *As prayed, put up this case after three weeks. In the mean time, petitioners may file interlocutory application."*

5. The present writ petition has been filed without impleading necessary party(s) as respondent. Although this Court has granted an indulgence in the matter, more than four years have elapsed but no

interlocutory application has been filed by the petitioners. Thus, it appears that the writ petitioners are not interested in pursuing the present writ petition.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is, hereby, dismissed.

(**Rajesh Kumar, J.**)

29.09.2026
Pawan/
Uploaded on 30.09.2026