IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P (S) No. 4787 of 2025

1. Sudama Paswan, S/o- Chalitar Ram, aged about 48 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Naudiha Bazar, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
2. Vishnupat Kumar, S/o- Rampravesh Ram, aged about 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
3. Kamlesh Paswan, S/o- Chandra Deo Paswan, aged about 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
4. Sunil Kumar Niraj, S/o- Mangresh Ram, aged about 49 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
5. Shivnath Thakur, S/o- Rampravesh Thakur, aged about 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Saraidih, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
6. Sanjay Vishwakarma, S/o- Dukhan Vishwakarma, aged about 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
7. Santosh Rajak, S/o- Saryu Rajak, aged about 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
8. Chandan Kumar, S/o- Vijay Prasad, aged about 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
9. Santosh Kumar, S/o- Ramjanam Sav, aged about 44 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
10. Anupa Kumari, D/o- Ram Prasad Sahu, aged about 37 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
11. Upendra Kumar Gupta, S/o- Ramnarayan Prasad Gupta, aged about 50 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
11. Pradip Kumar, S/o- Rambilash Prasad, aged about 50 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
13. Ramu Kumar, S/o- Sudama Prasad, aged about 39 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
14. Pooja Kumari, D/o- Rajeshwar Pd. Gupta, aged about 37 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
15. Laxmini Kumari, D/o- Jitan Paswan, aged about 42 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
16. Om Prakash, S/o- Shiv Shankar Vishwakarma, aged about 57 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
17. Nurul Hoda, S/o- Shahban Miyan, aged about 44 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
18. Rajendra Prasad, S/o- Laxman Saw, aged about 59 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
19. Sumitra Devi, D/o- Shatrudhan Prasad, aged about 58 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
20. Sabnam Khatun, D/o- Abdul Samad Ansari, aged about 32 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
21. Navnehal Ansari, S/o- Abdul Samad Ansari, aged about 32 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
22. Naresh Uranw, S/o- Mohar Uranw, aged about 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawadih, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
23. Amit Kumar, S/o- Harihar Saw, aged about 42 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.

24. Anil Kumar Singh, S/o- Ramswarup Prasad Mahatm, aged about 59 Years, R/o Vill.- Pokhraha, P.O.- Gulabjhari, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
25. Yogendra Kumar, S/o- Raj Kishor Singh, aged about 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Chuchru, P.O.- Gulabjhari, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
26. Sitaram Ram, S/o- Indra Deo Ram, aged about 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Jawar, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
27. Surendra Prasad Sharma, S/o- Gopal Prasad Sharma, aged about 51 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Nawatar, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
28. Sangita Kumari, D/o- Prayag Prasad, aged about 46 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
29. Usha Kumari, W/o- Birendra Prajapati, aged about 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Madhya, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
30. Anil Kumar Singh, S/o- Tapeshwar Prasad Singh, aged about 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawadih, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.

…… Petitioners

V E R S U S

1. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O and P.S Dhurwa, Dist-Ranchi
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, officiating from his office at O/o Deputy Commissioner, Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
3. The District Education Officer, Palamu, officiating from his office at Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
4. The Block Extension Officer-cum-Coordinator, Naudiha Bazar, having his office at Naudiha Bazar, P.O and P.S Naudiha Bazar, Dist-Palamu.
5. Jharkhand Education Project Council, State Project Office, Officiating from - Old HEC High School, JSCA Stadium Road, Sector - 3, P.O. & P.S. - Dhurwa, Dist- Ranchi
6. District Superintendent of Education-cum-under District Programme Officer, SSA, JEPC, Palamu, Office at - Collectorate Building, Medininagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District - Palamu, Jharkhand

…… Respondents

with

W.P (S) No. 4785 of 2025

1. Dharmendra Kumar S/o- Vishwanath Prasad Baitha Aged About - 49 Years R/O Vill.- Bara P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
2. Manoj Kumar Yadav S/o- Upendranath Yadav Aged About - 40 Years R/O Vill.- Nawadih P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
3. Santosh Kumar S/o- Ramlagan Prasad Aged About - 49 Years R/O Vill.- Risiyapa, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
4. Sushma Kumari D/o-Dindayal Prasad Aged About - 40 Years R/o Vill.+P.O.- Dagra P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
5. Awdhesh Kumar S/o-Aaditya Saw, Aged About - 38 Years R/o Vill.- Harina, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.

6. Md. Nure Alam S/o- Md Islam Aged About - 42 Years R/O Vill.- Teli yadih, P.O - Namudag, P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
7. Sudhir Kumar S/o-Kedar Paswan, Aged About - 42 Years R/O Vill.+P.O.- Namudag, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
8. Anuj Kr. Singh, S/o-Lalindra Kumar Singh, Aged About - 46 Years R/O Vill. +P.O.- Namudag P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
9. Lalan Prasad, S/o- Puran Ram Aged About - 56 Years R/O Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
10. Umesh Baitha, S/o- Rambilash Ram, Aged About - 54 Years R/O Vill.- Rabda, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
11. Ghanshyam Kumar, S/o-Prahlad Ram, Aged About - 46 Years, R/O Vill.+P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
12. Shahansha Alam, S/o-Md. Yusuf Ansari, Aged About - 38 Years, R/O Vill.+P.O. Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
13. Sangeeta Gupta, S/o- Gaya Prasad, Aged About - 49 Years, R/O Vill.- Risiyapa, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
14. Prawesh Ram, S/o- Gobind Ram, Aged About - 43 Years, R/O Vill.- Nawatanad Dhobani, P.O.+ P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
15. Sanjeet Kumar, S/o- Swarup Choudhari, Aged About - 39 Years, R/O Vill.+P.O.- Namudag P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
16. Pushpa Kumari, D/o- Chandan Prasad, Aged About - 40 Years, R/O Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
17. Mithilesh Kumar Ravi, S/o- Nand Deo Ram, Aged About - 54 Years R/O Vill.- Harina, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
18. Vijay Kumar Saw, S/o-Lalu Saw Aged About - 40 Years, R/O Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
19. Suchit Kumar, S/o- Bhola Saw, Aged About - 45 Years, R/O Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, ...Petitioner

…… Petitioners

V E R S U S

1. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O and P.S Dhurwa, Dist-Ranchi.
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, officiating from his office at O/o Deputy Commissioner, Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
3.The District Education Officer, Palamu, officiating from his office at Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
4.The Block Extension Officer-cum-Coordinator, Chhattarpur Block, having his office at Chhattarpur, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
5.Jharkhand Education Project Council, State Project Office, Officiating from - Old HEC High School, JSCA Stadium Road, Sector - 3, P.O. & P.S. - Dhurwa, Dist- Ranchi.
6.District Superintendent of Education-cum-under District Programme Officer, SSA, JEPC, Palamu, Office at - Collectorate Building,

Medininagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District - Palamu, Jharkhand

…… Respondents

with

W.P (S) No. 4915 of 2025

1. Abhishek Kumar, S/o- Dwarika Prasad, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
2. Mithilesh Kumar Yadav, S/o- Ganauri Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Jamua Bisunpur, P.O.- Bisunpur, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
3. Arun Kumar Vishwakarma, S/o- Ram Sundar Vishwakarma, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Nima, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
4. Kuldip Kumar Yadav, S/o- Kishun Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Goreyathan, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
5. Binay Kumar Yadav, S/o- Jagdish Yadav, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Goreyathan, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar,
6. Nikhil Ranjan, S/o- Manohar Yadav, Aged About - 42 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
7. Birendra Kumar Sharma, S/o- Tapeshwar Sharma, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Saraidih Tola Raghunidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
8. Anuj Kumar, S/o- L.T. Kedar Singh, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Bishunpur, P.O.- Bishunpur, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
9. Manoj Yadav, S/o- Yadu Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Kala, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
10. Manoj Rajak, S/o- Rampati Rajak, Aged About - 39 Year, R/o Vill.- Shild Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
11. Nandu Ram, S/o- Bishun Rajak, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Taridih, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
12. Ranjeet Kumar Singh, S/o- Gopal Singh, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Naumdag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
13. Bhola Prasad Gupta, S/o- Ram Prasad Saw, Aged About - 50 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
14. Santosh Kumar Pathak, S/o- Satnarayan Pathak, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Neema, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
15. Vikash Prasad Gupta, S/o- Girija Prasad Gupta, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Vill.- Gansa, P.O.- Dagra, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
16. Bajrangi Prasad Gupta, S/o- Vishwanath Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Sahiyar, P.O.- Dagra, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
17. Krishna Prasad, S/o- Harihar Saw, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
18. Sunita Puspadha, D/o- Brajesh Kumar, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Rabda, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
19. Parmeshwar Ram, S/o- Kailash Ram, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,

20. Guddu Prasad Yadav, S/o- Ram Dahin Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Lakrahi, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
21. Nagendra Kumar Yadav, S/o- Sudeshwar Yadav, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Silda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
22. Raj Kishor Kumar, S/o- Madan Prasad, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Shipur, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
23. Saddam Hussain, S/o- Md. Islam Ansari, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
24. Satyendar Prasad, S/o- Jagdish Prasad, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Singhana, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
25. Tarun Kumar Yadav, S/o- Yugeshwar Yadav, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Naudiha, P.O.- Naudiha Khajuri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
26. Suresh Yadav, S/o- Prasad Yadav, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.- Ratnag, P.O.- Dagara, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
27. Md. Alauddin, S/o- Abdul Sakur, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Shahpur, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
28. Mithilesh Kumar, S/o- Suresh Saw, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
29. Rajkumar Yadav, S/o- Bhola Yadav, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Gosaidih, P.O.- Udaigarh, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
30. Prema Kumari, S/o- Janki Saw, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Silda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
31. Ranjit Kumar, S/o- Mahabir Saw, Aged About - 44 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
32. Vishwanath Yadav, S/o- Kameshwar Yadav, Aged About - 44 Years, R/o Vill.- Khardiha, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
33. Bishwanath Kumar, S/o- Nirmal Ram, Aged About - 53 Years, R/o Vill.- Karkata, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
34. Shamshad Alam, S/o- Reyazudin Ansari, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
35. Anil Ram, S/o- Bhikhar Ram, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
36. Arjunjay Kumar Singh, S/o- Sudheshwar Singh, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Kuhkuh, P.O. + P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu
37. Dilmohammad Ansari, S/o- Mohammad Ansari, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Machawadohar, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
38. Saryu Prasad, S/o- Kesho Saw, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Rishiyapa, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
39. Kamta Prasad, S/o- Jayshree Prasad, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.- Harni, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
40. Ravindra Kumar Yadav, S/o- Dhaneshwar Yadav, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Dagra, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
41. Naresh Saw, S/o- Saryu Saw, Aged About - 47 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand

42. Binod Vishwakarma, S/o- Munshi Vishwakarma, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
43. Ravindra Rajak, S/o- Kapildeo Rajak, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
44. Sarita Kumari, D/O- Rajeshwar Singh, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
45. Birbal Prasad, S/o- Jaged Shwar Saw, Aged About - 47 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
46. Pintu Kumar, S/o- Rajendra Paswan, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Shahpur, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
47. Rakesh Kumar Yadav, S/o- Raj Kumar Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Goreyathan, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
48. Shiwdhyan Singh, S/o- Rupnarayan Singh, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Taridih, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
49. Manoj Kumar, S/o- Nandkishor Prasad, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Taridih, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
50. Dharmendra Kr. Patel, S/o- Kameshwar Singh, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Taridih, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
51. Saryu Thakur, S/o- Chandradeo Thakur, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.- Dumri, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
52. Ram Bilash Yadav, S/o- Bineshwar Yadav, Aged About - 42 Years, R/o Vill.- Bhitiharwa (Lalgara), P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
53. Shambhu Yadav, S/o- Padarath Yadav, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Kawal, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
54. Ravindra Singh, S/o- Ram Lakhan Singh, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Salaiya Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
55. Awadh Kishor Singh, S/o- Mithilesh Singh, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Bishunpur, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
56. Rahul Ranjan, S/o- Birendra Prasad Singh, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Udaygarh, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
57. Bibha Devi, D/O- Ram Lakhan Singh, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Gorho, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
58. Bashith Kumar Yadav, S/o- Rambiriksh Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
59. Mithlesh Yadav, S/o- Vishundev Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Goreyathan, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
60. Sarita Kumari, D/O- Rameshwar Chaudhary, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Bishunpur (Habarua), P.O. And P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
61. Vinay Kumar Shah, S/o- Bharat Prasad Singh, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,

62. Surajmal Kumar Gupta, S/o- Vishwanath Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Dagra, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
63. Dimpal Kumari, D/O- Nathuni Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 34 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
64. Mukesh Kumar, S/o- Parmeshwar Pd. Gupta, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
65. Sabita Kumar, D/O- Radheshyam Prasad, Aged About - 42 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
66. Santosh Kumar Singh, S/o- Parshuram Singh, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Korami, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
67. Santosh Kumar, S/o- Dharmdeo Rajak, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, Tandipar, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
68. Dilip Kumar Singh, S/o- Kailash Prasad Singh, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.- Mayapur, P.O.- Solabhjhari, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
69. Manoj Kumar, S/o- Balmukund Prajapati, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Kawal, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
70. Premlata Kumari, D/O- Gariban Das, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Harina, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
71. Arvind Kumar Das, S/o- Salik Das, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
72. Shiv Yadav, S/o- Ramdeo Yadav, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Birhordih, P.O.- Saraidih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
73. Ranjeet Kumar Gupta, S/o- Ram Birichh Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
74. Raju Kumar Yadav, S/o- Shree Yadav, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Nima, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
75. Rakesh Kumar Gupta, S/o- Tilak Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+ P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist. Palamu,
76. Shivnath Vishwakarma, S/o- Murli Vishwakarma, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Nima, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
77. Punam Kumari, W/O- Anup Kumar Singh, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
78. Manoj Kumar Gupta, S/o- Nandkishor Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
79. Vijay Kumar Singh, S/o- Late Ram Khelawan Singh, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Vill.- Dumari, P.O.- Taridih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
80. Vijay Kumar Mehta, S/o- Shyam Bihari Mahto, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Taridih, P.O.- Taridih, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
81. Arun Kumar, S/o- Amaresh Prasad Mehta, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Taridih, P.O.- Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
82. Ashok Kumar Gupta, S/o- Tilak Prasad Gupta, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
83. Ashok Kumar Yadav, S/o- Rajdeo Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand

84. Vijay Kumar Yadav, S/o- Muneshwar Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
85. Sikendra Ram, S/o- Indra Deo Ram, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand
86. Bhim Singh, S/o- Suryapati Singh, Aged About - 47 Years, R/o Vill.- Shilda Khurd, P.O.- Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu,
87. Pramod Kumar, S/o- Mahendra Singh, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village- Singha, P.O. and P.S. Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu

…… Petitioners

V E R S U S

1. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O and P.S Dhurwa, Dist-Ranchi
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, officiating from his office at O/o Deputy Commissioner, Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
3. The District Education Officer, Palamu, officiating from his office at Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
4. The Block Extension Officer-cum-Coordinator, Naudiha Bazar, having his office at Naudiha Bazar, P.O and P.S Naudiha Bazar, Dist-Palamu.
5. Jharkhand Education Project Council, State Project Office, Officiating from - Old HEC High School, JSCA Stadium Road, Sector - 3, P.O. & P.S. - Dhurwa, Dist- Ranchi
6. District Superintendent of Education-cum-under District Programme Officer, SSA, JEPC, Palamu, Office at - Collectorate Building, Medininagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District - Palamu, Jharkhand

…… Respondents

with

W.P (S) No. 4917 of 2025

1. Basant Kumar, S/o- Chandrdeep Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village- Madanpur, P.S.+P.O.- Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
2. Santosh Kumar Singh, S/o- Ganesh Singh, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.-Sildag, P.O.+P.S.- Chhatarpur, , Dist.- Palamu
3. Akhilesh Ram, S/o- Chandradeo Ram, Aged About 49, R/o Vill.-Supha, P.O.- Jhargara, P.S. Hussainabad, Dist.- Palamu,
4. Shambhu Yadav, S/o-Yugeshwar Yadav, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Vill.- Sushiganj, P.O.-Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur Dist.- Palamu,
5. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal, S/o-Shivnath Prasad, Aged About 37 years, R/o Vill. + P.O And P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu.
6. Manoj Kumar Yadav, S/o- Krit Yadav, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Vill. Sushiganj, P.O. Latheya, P.S. Chhatarpurr, Dist.- Palamu,
7. Madhu Kumari, D/o-Rama Shankar Paswan, 42 Years, R/o Vill. Sushiganj, P.O And P.S Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
8. Sunil Kumar, aged about 55 years S/o- Surendra Nath Gupta, R/o Village Manugain P.O.-Chhatarpur, P.S. Chhatarpur Dist.- Palamu,

9. Shambhu Prasad, S/o- Dukhan Saw, Aged About 51 Years,, R/o Vill.- Sushiganj, P.O.- Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
10. Santosh Prasad, S/o-Balabhadra Prasad, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Telari, P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
11. Binay Kumar Yadav, S/o- Yugal Yadav, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.-Telari, P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
12. Anuj Kumar Thakur, S/o- Lallu Thakur, Aged About- 37 Years, Vill.- Sildag, P.O.+P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
13. Vinod Singh, S/o- Haridas Singh, Aged About- 56 Years, R/o Vill.- P.O.+P.S.- Choukhada, Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
14. Sosan Kachhap, D/O- Bharosa Kachhap, Aged About- 43 Years, R/o Vill. Kurkuta P.O.- Telari, P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu
15. Ram Rakshya Singh, S/o-Jagdish Singh, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Vill. - Baghamara, P.O.-Naudiha Khajuri, P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
16. Geeta Kumari, D/O- Mundrika Chamar, Aged About- 38 Years, Kauwal Tola R/o Vill.+P.O.-Mahulaniya, P.S. Chhatarpur Dist.- Palamu,
17. Umesh Kumar Mishra, S/o- Raj Kumar Mishra, Aged About 53 Year R/o Vill.- Khaitin P.O.+P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu,
18. Satyendra Kumar Singh, S/o-Late Ramdas Singh, Aged About-58 Years, R/o Vill.- Nimiya, P.O.-Dulhi, P.S.- Patan, Dist.- Palamu,
19. Sushil Kumar, S/o- Ramautar Singh, Aged About- 44 Years. R/o Vill.- Babhandi, P.O. Latheya, P.S.-Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu,
20. Akhilesh Kumar, S/o-Muneshwar Manjhi, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Village- Dali, P.O.-Dali, P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu,
21. Md Irfan Ali, S/o- Md Alisher Ahmad, Aged About 39, R/o Vill.- Khendra Kala, P.O. And P.S -Naudiha Kajuri, Dist.- Palamu,
22. Mithilesh Kumar Yadav, S/o-Rajkishore Yadab, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Vill. Arar, P.O.-Khodhi, P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu,
23. Kanchan Kumari, W/O- Ranjit Kumar Gupta, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Vill. Rudwa, P.O.-Telari, P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu,
24. Ramabadan Singh, S/o-Mukhdev Singh, Aged About - 59 Years, R/o Vill. - Kauwal, P.O. And P.S - Telari, Dist.- Palamu, **…… Petitioners**

V E R S U S

1. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O and P.S Dhurwa, Dist-Ranchi
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, officiating from his office at O/o Deputy Commissioner, Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
3. The District Education Officer, Palamu, officiating from his office at Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
4. The Block Extension Officer-cum-Coordinator, Chhattarpur, having his office at Chhattarpur, P.O and P.S Chhattarpur, Dist-Palamu.
5. Jharkhand Education Project Council, State Project Office, Officiating from - Old HEC High School, JSCA Stadium Road, Sector - 3, P.O. & P.S. - Dhurwa, Dist- Ranchi
6. District Superintendent of Education-cum-under District Programme Officer, SSA, JEPC, Palamu, Office at - Collectorate Building,

Medininagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District - Palamu, Jharkhand

…… Respondents

with

W.P (S) No. 5080 of 2025

1. Sudama Prasad Rajak, S/o- Kardhani Baitha, Aged About - 50 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawatand, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
2. Pramod Kumar, S/o- Yadunandan Mali, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Mahipata, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu.
3. Md Eqbal, S/o- Abdur Razzaque, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Marwa Tola Kajaroo, P.O. and P.S. - Udaygarh, Dist.- Palamu.
4. Binod Kumar Singh, S/o- Ram Dheyan Singh, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.- Pokhraha, P.O. and P.S. - Gulabjhari, Dist.- Palamu.
5. Rajendra Kumar Raman, S/o- Shiv Bhajan Ram, Aged About - 50 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
6. Ramanand Mishra, S/o- Sachidand Mishra, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.- Khatin, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
7. Sachin Kumar Pandey, S/o- Baikunth Nath Pandey, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiran, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
8. Dilip Prasad, S/o- Suresh Prasad, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Sahaydih, P.O. - Manjholi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
9. Dharmendra Kumar, S/o- Surendra Pd. Thakur, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
10. Nilam Kumari, S/o- Tarkeshwar Sharma, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
11. Shriram Choudhary, S/o- Binayak Ram, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
12. Kumari Urmila, D/o- Ram Rakshya Ram, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
13. Upedendra Kumar, S/o- Vishanudev Saw, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Khaitin, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
14. Sunita Kumari, W/o- Murari Prasad Singh, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Khardiha, P.O. - Sairediha, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist.- Palamu, Jharkhand.
15. Umesh Ram, S/o- Ram Prasad Ram, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Madanpur, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
16. Jitendra Kumar Gupta, S/o- Sudarshan Pd. Gupta, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
17. Jaiyanti Kumari, S/o- Chhathu Saw, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Khodhi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
18. Baijyanti Sharma, W/o- Suresh Vishwakarma, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Thekani, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
19. Surendra Goswami, S/o- Jeetu Goswami, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
20. Santosh Kumar Das, S/o- Nirmal Das, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.- Bari, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
21. Sunil Kumar Yadav, S/o- Udheswhar Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Tilharwa, P.O. - Chaparbar, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.

22. Ajeet Kumar, S/o- Bhola Mistri, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Manhu, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
23. Arun Kumar Ram, S/o- Satyanarayan Ram, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
24. Vijay Ram, S/o- Basudev Ram, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Vishaypur, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
25. Niranjan Kumar, S/o- Shambhu Saran Singh, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
26. Sashilata Devi, D/o- Gupteshwar Singh, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
27. Ashok Kumar Singh, S/o- Ram Pravesh Singh, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
28. Amod Kumar Sharma, S/o- Suryadev Mistri, Aged About - 32 Years, R/o Vill.- Manhu, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
29. Niranjan Kumar Pathak, S/o- Umapati Pathak, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Lewad, P.O. and P.S. - Naudiha Khajuri, Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
30. Umesh Kumar, S/o- Shyam Sundar Ram, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Naudiha, P.S. - Khajuri, Dist.- Palamu.
31. Rajeshwar Prasad Yadav, S/o- Dhul Yadav, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Naudiha Khajuri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
32. Rajendra Kumar Ravi, S/o- Ramrup Ram, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Tempo, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
33. Sarita Kumari, W/o- Basan Kumar Vishwakarma, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Mamhu, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
34. Janakdeo Yadav, S/o- Harish Chandra Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Mamhu, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
35. Shiv Shankar Ram, S/o- Girwar, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.- Kachanpur, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
36. Md Raza Kadari, S/o- Md Sarfuddin, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
37. Aradhna Kumari, D/o- Bhardul Manjhi, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
38. Vinay Kumar, S/o- Rajdeo Paswan, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
39. Pramod Ram, S/o- Bhagi Rathi Ram, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
40. Asant Paswan, S/o- Pukaru Paswan, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
41. Upendra Kumar Paswan, S/o- Bhikhar Paswan, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Kachampur, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
42. Dilip Kumar Gupta, S/o- Ram Chandra Prasad, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Kamacharai, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
43. Ferdinand Kumar, S/o- Jagu Ram, aged about - 41 years, R/o Vill.+P.O.- Dali,, P.S.- Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu. **(Deleted vide order dated 17.02.2026)**

44. Khurshid Alam, S/o- Md Ismail Ansari, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
45. Satyendra Ram, S/o- Jagdish Ram, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
46. Ramesh Ram, S/o- Rampati Ram, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Mamhu, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
47. Manoj Kumar Gupta, S/o- Bhola Prasad Sahu, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Nawa Bazar, P.O.+P.S. - Nawa Bazar, Dist. - Palamu.
48. Rabina Khatun, S/o- Ismail Miyan, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
49. Shrawan Kumar, S/o- Yamuna Prasad, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
50. Ashish Kumar Jayswal, S/o- Vishwanath Prasad Jayswal, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Arar, P.O. - Khadi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
51. Shambhu Kumar Yadav, S/o- Devki Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Murumdag, P.O. - Murumdag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
52. Dinesh Ram, S/o- Chandu Ram, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.- Kachampur, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
53. Niranjan Das, S/o- Ramjanam Das, Aged About - 53 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
54. Shweta Gupta, D/o- Nandu Gupta, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudwo, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
55. Kapildeo Yadav, S/o- Suba Yadav, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.- Mamhu, P.O. - Mumkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
56. Surendra Kumar Paswan, S/o- Birju Dusadh, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Shiwdyaldih, P.O. - Naudiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
57. Ramashish Yadav, S/o- Mahabir Yadav, Aged About - 33 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Murmudag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
58. Lalita Kumari, W/o- Laxman Prasad, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
59. Umesh Yadav, S/o- Dukhi Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Murmudag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
60. Narayan Saw, S/o- Yuga Saw, Aged About - 56 Years, R/o Vill.- Kalapahar, P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
61. Ramawtar Ram, S/o- Ram Nandan Ram, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Kalapahar, P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
62. Sindhu Kumar Yadav, S/o- Jitan Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Bagaiya, P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
63. Ajay Kumar Yadav, S/o- Mahabir Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Murmudag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
64. Ram Pravesh Yadav, S/o- Naresh Yadav, Aged About - 33 Years, R/o Vill.- Gundari, P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
65. Nagendra Kumar, S/o- Jagdish Ram, Aged About - 34 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
66. Dil Mohammad, S/o- Anis Ansari, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
67. Bhishm Narayan Singh, S/o- Shorai Singh, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.

68. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal, S/o- Raja Ram Prasad, Aged About - 56 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
69. Brij Bhushan Prasad, S/o- Mahendra Prasad, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
70. Birendra Prasad, S/o- Mahendra Prasad, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
71. Mobin Ansari, S/o- Ali Hussain Miyan, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
72. Wasim Akram, S/o- Ismile Mian, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
73. Abid Ansari, S/o- Nurullah Ansari, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
74. Akhtar Ansari, S/o- Yasin Miya, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
75. Narendra Kumar Singh, S/o- Parmeshwar Singh, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
76. Ramnath Ram, S/o- Rajdeo Ram, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.- Kurkuta, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
77. Sukhlal Ram, S/o- Lakhan Ram, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Charai, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
78. Kumar Bhagwan Singh, S/o- Kapildeo Singh, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Khajuri Naudiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
79. Kalam Ansari, S/o- Israil Ansari, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
80. Bandna Kumari, S/o- Baijnath Ram, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
81. Safique Ahmed Ansari, S/o- Jinnat Ansari, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.- Chegauna, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
82. Gulam Shahid Ansari, S/o- Sobarti Ansari, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
83. Sakim Ansari, S/o- Md Asique, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
84. Enamul Haque, S/o- Md Shobarti, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
85. Aphsar Ansari, S/o- Khalil Ansari, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
86. Upendra Kumar Yadav, S/o- Brahmdeo Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Arar, P.O. - Khorhi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
87. Sudama Prasad Yadav, S/o- Ram Bilash Yadav, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Arar, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
88. Ramjit Ram, S/o- Baldeo Ram, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
89. Mahendra Kumar Yadav, S/o- Lakhan Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Bandhudih, P.O. and P.S. - Udaygrah, Dist. - Palamu.
90. Binod Bihari, S/o- Dukhi Yadav, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.- Bandhudih, P.O. and P.S. - Udaygrah, Dist. - Palamu.

91. Ranjeet Kumar Singh, S/o- Balkeshwar Mahatam, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Bandhudih, P.O. - Udaygrah, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
92. Binod Singh, S/o- Sagar Singh, Aged About - 56 Years, R/o Vill.- Chorar, P.O. - Udaygrah, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
93. Rina Kumari, D/o- Ramchandra Singh, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Bhandardih, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
94. Vijay Kumar Gupta, S/o- Shiv Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
95. Madan Kumar, S/o- Shiv Baran Ram, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Khandra Kala, P.O. – Khajuri, Nawadiha, P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.- Palamu.
96. Anita Kumari, S/o- Ram Bhajan Singh, Aged About - 32 Years, R/o Vill.- Bagiya, P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
97. Amrendra Kumar, S/o- Baliram Prasad Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Bagiya, P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
98. Priyanka Kumari, S/o- Brajesh Kumar Singh, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Kauwal, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
99. Upendra Singh, S/o- Krishna Singh, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
100. Vikash Kumar, S/o- Yugeshwar Ram, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Dali, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
101. Sanjay Kumar, S/o- Vishwanath Saw, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Rabda, P.O. - Namudag, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist. - Palamu.
102. Mangal Yadav, S/o- Bhola Yadav, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Jawar, P.O. - Khairadohar, P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist. - Palamu.
103. Sushila Kunwar, S/o- Sanjay Prasad, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.- Charain, P.O. - Charain, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
104. Ramashish Ram, S/o- Virja Ram, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
105. Pankaj Kumar, S/o- Ambika Prasad Jaiswal, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Kund Muhhla, P.O.+P.S. - Daltonganj, Dist. - Palamu.
106. Rajesh Prasad Yadav, S/o- Ram Lakhan Prasad Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Bagiya, P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
107. Ravindra Kumar Yadav, S/o- Lakhan Yadav, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiru, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
108. Bishwanath Ram, S/o- Ghutani Ram, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S. - Naudiha Bazar, Dist. - Palamu.
109. Anjani Kumari, S/o- Bigu Ram, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
110. Pramila Kumari, W/o- Awadh Kumar Singh, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Danduta, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
111. Satyendra Yadav, S/o- Nanhak Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Tardih, P.O. - Khajuri Naudiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
112. Ram Narayan Yadav, S/o- Chandradev Yadav, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.- Dundar, P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.

113. Manoj Kumar Singh, S/o- Madho Singh, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
114. Pradip Kumar Singh, S/o- Late Surendra Singh, Aged About - 55 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
115. Preeti Kumari, D/o- Birendra Singh, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Telari, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhattarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
116. Vikram Kumar Singh, S/o- Birendra Kumar Singh, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Telari, P.O.+P.S. - Telari, Dist. - Palamu.
117. Mritunjay Kumar Singh, S/o- Surendra Prasad Singh, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.- Mahuri, P.S. - Hussainabad, Dist. - Palamu.
118. Brajesh Kumar Singh, S/o- Chandra Shekhar Singh, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
119. Dinesh Ram, S/o- Ramlagan Ram, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Manhu, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
120. Kusum Kumari, W/o- Indal Yadav, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Chiro, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
121. Ajay Ram, S/o- Phenku Ram, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudawa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
122. Dilip Kumar Singh, S/o- Upendra Nath Singh, Aged About - 58 Years, R/o Vill.- Khajuri, P.O. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
123. Gita Kumari, D/o- Gupteshwar Prasad Singh, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.- Khajuri, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
124. Pramod Kumar Jaiswal, S/o- Hazari Saw, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.- Arar, P.O. - Khodhi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
125. Gauraw Kumar Yadav, S/o- Jagdish Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Arar, P.O. - Khodhi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
126. Jitendra Yadav, S/o- Malikchand Yadav, Aged About - 32 Years, R/o Vill.- Hutukdag, P.O. - Hutukdag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
127. Santosh Kumar Pathak, S/o- Gupteshwar Pathak, Aged About - 47 Years, R/o Vill.- Hutukdag, P.O. - Hutukdag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
128. Kausar Ali, S/o- Yar Mohammad, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.- Akabasa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
129. Amarik Yadav, S/o- Balkeshwar Yadav, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Sushiganj, P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
130. Rajbali Singh, S/o- Bineshar Singh, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Taradih, P.O. - Naudiha, Khajuri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
131. Mohammad Zafeeruddin, S/o- Md Subhan, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Khendra, P.O. - Naudiha, Khajuri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
132. Surendra Yadav, S/o- Mukhdev Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Gontha, P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
133. Niranjan Kumar Yadav, S/o- Kail Yadav, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.- Manjhali, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
134. Ram Lal Yadav, S/o- Naku Yadav, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Manjhouli, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
135. Vikash Kumar, S/o- Narendra Kumar, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Tenudih, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.

136. Mahendra Kumar Yadav, S/o- Sita Ram Yadav, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Reganiya, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
137. Manoj Yadav, S/o- Mahendra Yadav, Aged About - 42 Years, R/o Vill.- Dundur, P.O. - Latheya, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
138. Sanaullah, S/o- Karim Baksh, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Akabasa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
139. Gulam Sarwar Ansari, S/o- Md. Ibrahim Ansari, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Akabasa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
140. Saryu Yadav, S/o- Md. Phaguni Yadav, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Dinadag, P.O. - Kauwal, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
141. Umesh Kumar Singh, S/o- Rambihari Singh, Aged About - 52 Years, R/o Vill.- Karma, P.O. - Hutukdag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
142. Premchand Kumar, S/o- Banarsi Prasad, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Karma, P.O. - Hutukdag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
143. Arjun Oraon, S/o- Balgobind Oraon, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Hutukdag, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
144. Rambha Kumar, D/o- Ram Naresh Singh, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Karma, P.O. - Hutukdag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
145. Soni Devi, W/o- Santosh Prasad, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudwa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
146. Mirtubijay Singh, S/o- Hari Gopal Singh, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Chuchudumad, P.O. - Manjhauli, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
147. Birendra Singh, S/o- Munni Singh, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Manjhauli, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
148. Raj Kumar Yadav, S/o- Sheo Yadav, Aged About - 49 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Manjhauli, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
149. Arun Kumar Yadav, S/o- Sitaram Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudwa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
150. Dwarika Singh, S/o- Tapeshwar Singh, Aged About - 47 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudwa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
151. Sarita Kumari, W/o- Prem Chan Kumar, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudwa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
152. Om Prakash Gupta, S/o- Arjun Prasad Gupta, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
153. Mukesh Thakur, S/o- Shiv Kumar Thakur, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Murmudag, P.O. - Dalli, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
154. Pramod Choudhary, S/o- Ram Charitar Chudhari, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Charain, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
155. Shiv Pujan Prasad, S/o- Sur Bihari Prasad, Aged About - 38 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Charain, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
156. Chandan Vishwakarma, S/o- Girija Vishwakarma, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Karma, P.O. - Charain, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
157. Sakendra Yadav, S/o- Prameshwar Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Rudwa, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
158. Awdhesh Kumar Yadav, S/o- Matukdhari Yadav, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Kumbhi Khurd, P.O.+P.S. - Nawa Bazar, Dist. - Palamu.
159. Yamuna Prajapati, S/o- Lakhan Prajapati, Aged About - 47 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.

160. Damodar Prasad, S/o- Devki Saw, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.- Manjhauli, P.O. and P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
161. Dinesh Kumar Yadav, S/o- Jagdish Yadav, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Sungari, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
162. Raghaw Ram Singh, S/o- Krishna Prasad Singh, Aged About - 53 Years, R/o Vill.- Dhakcha, P.O. - Pachmo, P.S. - Hariharganj, Dist. - Palamu.
163. Nageshwar Singh, S/o- Krit Singh, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.- Tuktuka, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
164. Binay Kumar Singh, S/o- Kamata Prasad Singh, Aged About - 58 Years, R/o Vill.- Mashihani, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
165. Radheshwari Prasad, S/o- Indradeo Ram, Aged About - 51 Years, R/o Vill.- Namudag, P.O. - Namudag, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
166. Sanjay Kumar Singh, S/o- Mandrika Singh, Aged About - 48 Years, R/o Vill.- Nimiya, P.O. - Dulhi, P.S. - Patan, Dist. - Palamu.
167. Manoranjan Kumar Singh, S/o- Ramoutar Singh, Aged About - 35 Years, R/o Vill.- Murmudag, P.O. - Mukeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
168. Manoj Kumar Singh, S/o- Mukhdeo Singh, Aged About - 36 Years, R/o Vill.- Murmudag, P.O. - Munkeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
169. Sanjay Ram, S/o- Paran Ram, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Chodar, P.O. - Udaigarh, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
170. Ajay Kumar Yadav, S/o- Jhubal Yadav, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Khodhi, P.O. - Khodhi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
171. Suresh Yadav, S/o- Puran Yadav, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.+P.O. - Khodhi, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
172. Lalita Kumari, W/o- Murli Prasad, Aged About - 45 Years, R/o Vill.- Saharaswa, P.O. - Mukeri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
173. Indu Devi, W/o- Satyanarayan Prasad Jaiswal, Aged About - 54 Years, R/o Vill.- Arar, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
174. Wokindra Ram, S/o- Kameshwar Ram, Aged About - 40 Years, R/o Vill.- Khendra Kala, P.O. - Khajuri, Naudiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
175. Dinesh Prasad Gupta, S/o- Charitar Saw, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Khendra Khurd, P.O. - Khajuri Nawadiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
176. Archana Kumari, D/o- Niranjan Prasad Jaiswal, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Khendra Kala, P.O. - Khajuri, Naudiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
177. Satyendra Paswan, S/o- Bhuneshwar Paswan, Aged About - 37 Years, R/o Vill.- Tardih, P.O. - Naudih Khajuri, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
178. Akhileshwar Yadav, S/o- Dinesh Yadav, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.- Tuktuka, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
179. Dhananjay Kumar Pandey, S/o- Shyam Bihari Das, Aged About - 43 Years, R/o Vill.- Bara-03, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
180. Navin Kumar Singh, S/o- Ajeet Kumar Singh, Aged About - 41 Years, R/o Vill.- Bhadwa, P.O. - Khajuri, Naudiha, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.

181. Umesh Prasad Yadav, S/o- Bishwanath Prasad Yadav, Aged About - 46 Years, R/o Vill.- Murmudag, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
182. Jitendra Prasad Gupta, S/o- Balmukund Saw, Aged About - 39 Years, R/o Vill.- Mashihani, P.O.+P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu. **(Deleted vide order dated 17.02.2026)**
183. Sanjay Kumar Singh, S/o- Suresh Prasad Singh, Aged About - 57 Years, R/o Vill.- Kawal, P.O. - Telari, P.S. - Chhatarpur, Dist. - Palamu.
184. Chandan Prasad Gupta, S/o Suryadev Prasad Gupta, aged about 40 years, R/o village-Chhatarpur, P.O. Chhatarpur, P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu.
185.Anuj Kumar Yadav, S/o Shayam Narayan Yadav, aged about 40 years, R/o village-Basdiha, P.O. Chhatarpur, P.S. Chhatarpur, Dist.-Palamu.

…… Petitioners

V E R S U S

1. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O and P.S Dhurwa, Dist-Ranchi
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, officiating from his office at O/o Deputy Commissioner, Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
3. The District Education Officer, Palamu, officiating from his office at Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
4. The Block Extension Officer-cum-Coordinator, Chhattarpur Block, having his office at Chhattarpur, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
5. Jharkhand Education Project Council, State Project Office, Officiating from - Old HEC High School, JSCA Stadium Road, Sector - 3, P.O. & P.S. - Dhurwa, Dist- Ranchi
6. District Superintendent of Education-cum-under District Programme Officer, SSA, JEPC, Palamu, Office at - Collectorate Building, Medininagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District - Palamu, Jharkhand

…… Respondents

with

W.P (S) No. 5240 of 2025

Usha Kumari, aged about 38 years, daughter of Yamuna Ram, permanent resident of Village-Rabda, P.O. Namudag, P.S. Naudiha Bazar, Dist.-Palamu.

…… Petitioners

V E R S U S

1. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Department of School Education and Literacy, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O and P.S Dhurwa, Dist-Ranchi
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, officiating from his office at O/o Deputy Commissioner, Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
3. The District Education Officer, Palamu, officiating from his office at Collectorate Building, Medninagar, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.
4. The Block Extension Officer-cum-Coordinator, Chhattarpur Block, having his office at Chhattarpur, P.O and P.S Daltonganj, Dist-Palamu.

5. Jharkhand Education Project Council, State Project Office, Officiating from - Old HEC High School, JSCA Stadium Road, Sector - 3, P.O. & P.S. - Dhurwa, Dist- Ranchi
6. District Superintendent of Education-cum-under District Programme Officer, SSA, JEPC, Palamu, Office at - Collectorate Building, Medininagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District - Palamu, Jharkhand

…… Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

.....

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Adv
		Mr. Parth Jalan, Adv
For the Respondent-JEPC	:	Mr. Krishna Murari, Adv
For Respondent State	:	Ms. Oishi Das, Adv
		Mr. Priyadarshini, GP-VI
		Mr. Uttam Kumar Das, AC to GP-VI
		Mr. Raj Vardhan. Adv

.....

C.A.V. ON: 24/09/2026 **PRONOUNCED ON:04 /11/2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. This batch of writ petitions is heard together, as the relief and the contentions by the parties sought is common in nature and disposed of as a common order. On the request of the parties, *WP(S) 4915 of 2025 (Abhishek Kumar and Ors v. State of Jharkhand and Ors)* is taken up as the lead case.

3. In the instant petitions, the petitioner has, *inter alia*, prayed for issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing the order, bearing Reference No. 1575, dated January 16, 2025, issued by the First Appellate Authority-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Palamu (Annexure-7), by which the services of the Petitioners have been terminated. The Petitioner has further prayed for all consequential reliefs.

Submission on behalf of Petitioners.

4. Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Ld. Counsel representing the Petitioners, assisted by Mr. Parth Jalan. Adv, submits that the Petitioners in these batch of cases are all para-teachers working in two blocks within the District of Palamu,

i.e., Naudiah Bazar and Chhatarpur. The services of the Petitioner have been terminated by virtue of the impugned order dated 16.1.2025 by the First Appellate Authority-cum-Deputy Commissioner, Palamu.

5. Ld. Counsel further submits that the impugned order is common in all the petitions. The impugned order contains eight annexures (Annexure A to H). Annexure-A and B are such para-teachers, whose appointment and qualification has found to be in accordance with law.

6. Annexure C and Annexure D, are persons serving as para-teachers in Naudiah Bazar and Chhatarpur respectively. The persons mentioned in these categories are those whose services have been terminated on the ground that the Block level recommendation submitted by candidates, did not match with the recommendation in the Block Offices. The persons whose name feature in Annexure C of the impugned order have filed *WP(S) 4785 of 2025* and whose names are part of Annexure D of the impugned order have filed *WP(S) 4917 of 2025*.

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioners, further submits that the next category of Petitioners is those whose names feature in Annexure E and Annexure F of the impugned order. These are such para-teachers whose services are terminated on account that they failed to provide documents pertaining to their recommendations from the block office. Their recommendation was also not found in the block offices. Such persons whose names feature in Annexures E have filed *WP(S) No. 4915 of 2025, WP(S) No. 4787 of 2025 and WP(S) No. 5240 of 2025*. Persons whose name feature in Annexure F of the impugned order have filed *WP(S) No. 5080 of 2025*.

8. Learned counsel representing the Petitioners on merits submits that the Petitioners' appointment was made between the years 2006 and 2008 under the *Sarv Shiksha Abhiyan* implemented by Notification dated August 4, 2002, and accordingly the Petitioners were in service for more than 16 years. The appointment of para teachers under the *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* was made by the Aam Sabha of the concerned village pursuant to an advertisement. Recommendations made by the Aam Sabha was submitted to the block office, whereupon after proper scrutiny, agreements were executed by and between the selected candidate and Secretary of the Aam Sabha.

9. The Ld. counsel submits that in the case at hand, advertisements were issued, and pursuant to the selections, recommendations were made to the block office, after which agreements were signed.

10. Learned counsel further submits that in the year 2012, an inquiry was initiated on the basis of certain complaints raising concerns pertaining to a discrepancy in the selection/appointment of para-teachers. However, as the inquiry itself suffered from several lacunae, another inquiry was directed in the year 2019. The findings returned in the inquiry conducted in the year 2019, contradicted with the findings returned in the year 2012. This resulted in the constitution of a special committee by the *Vidhan Sabha*, which recommended that a fresh inquiry be conducted by a high-powered committee. In light of such recommendation, a high-powered committee was constituted vide notification dated 19.03.2021 (Annexure E of the counter-affidavit).

11. The High-Powered Committee, in its report dated 30.11.2022 (Annexure F of the counter-affidavit), found that a total of 512 para-teachers

(302 para-teachers from Chattarpur and 210 para-teachers from Naudiah Bazar), whose selection/recommendation was not in accordance with the guidelines. On the basis of this, the respondent JEPC, in its 64th sitting on 10.7.2023, recommended that such persons who met the eligibility criteria, at the time of their appointment but their selection process suffered from some discrepancy in the selection process would be treated as a special case, and all benefits under the *Jharkhand Assistant Teacher Service Rules, 2015*, would be given to such candidates. However, the services of such candidates who neither met the eligibility criteria, nor was their selection process done in accordance with law, was to be removed from service. These recommendations were forwarded to the disciplinary cum administrative committee for further action. Pursuant to such a recommendation and until a decision was taken by the disciplinary cum administrative committee, the State Project Director, vide his order dated 13.10.2023, directed that no services would be taken from these 512 teachers. The petitioners assailed the said order by filing a batch of writ petitions, being *WP(S) No. 6021 of 2023* and other analogous cases. This Court, vide its order dated 1.7.2024, refused to interfere with the order dated 13.10.2023, primarily on the ground that the issue was pending before the disciplinary cum administrative committee, but directed that the concerned authority should take a decision expeditiously.

12. The Disciplinary Administrative Committee took a decision in favour of the petitioners on 13.03.2024 and 27.04.2024. However, the said decision was assailed before the First Appellate Authority (i.e. Deputy

Commissioner, Palamu), who passed the impugned order terminating the services of the petitioner.

13. On the basis of the above facts, Mr. Gadodia representing the Petitioners submits that the impugned order is not only arbitrary but also perverse. He contended that the cases of such para-teachers whose selection process suffered from certain procedural lacunae were treated to be special cases, and their services were to be regularised. The Ld. Counsel, on basis of *paragraph xi)* of the counter-affidavit (filed in WP(S) No. 4915 of 2025), submits that the admitted position is that the disciplinary cum administrative committee had held in the favour of the Petitioners. He further submits that only such candidates who did not possess the eligibility criteria were liable to be terminated.

14. Learned counsel specifically submitted that the Petitioners before this Court are meeting the eligibility criteria as required at the time of their appointment. According to the Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner, this is apparent from the fact that such persons who did not possess the eligibility criteria were kept in a separate category, and their names feature in Annexure G and Annexure H of the impugned order, while the name of the Petitioners before this Court features in Annexure C to F of the impugned order.

15. Further, the Learned counsel submits that it was not the onus of the petitioners to submit the recommendation made by the block-level committee. The same was an internal procedure which had to be done by the respondents themselves. He has tried to substantiate the same by placing heavy reliance on the information provided to the Special Committee on 26.07.2019, which

categorically states that the onus to maintain all documents pertaining to the selection of the para teachers was to be maintained in the office of the block education project officer or in the office of the District Education Superintendent.

16. The Ld. counsel further submits that the long-term service of the petitioner has been terminated merely on the premise that either the block-level recommendation submitted by the petitioners did not match with that found in the block-level office, or the petitioners failed to submit the same before the first appellate authority. He submits that when the onus to maintain the documents was with respondent itself; there was no occasion for the petitioners to have submitted such recommendation.

17. Learned counsel has placed heavy reliance on the documents containing details for verification and updation, uploaded by respondent itself on *e-vidyavahini* portal, which specifically contains the date of approval by the block committee/induction training. He submits that the *e-vidyaavahini* portal was formed pursuant to notification issued on 24.10.2019, the purpose for which was to update all information pertaining to the para-teachers. Once the respondent themselves has accepted the date of approval by the block committee, the findings returned by the first appellate authority become perverse. A table to this effect has been submitted by the Learned counsel for the Petitioner, which is reproduced as under:

WP(S) 4787 of 2025

Name of the Petitioner	Block Development Approval/ Induction Training Start Date (From the Rejoinder)
Sudama Paswan	28.08.2008
Vishnupat Kumar	29.12.2006
Kamlesh Paswan	29.12.2006

Shiva Nath Thakur	11.10.2007
Sanjay Vishwakarma	29.08.2007
Santosh Rajak	29.09.2006
Anupa Kumari	05.07.2007
Rajendra Prasad	29.09.2006
Sumitra Devi	29.08.2007
Anil Kumar Singh	29.12.2006
Yogendra Kumar	26.03.2003
Sangita Kumari	16.11.2006
Usha Kumari	21.07.2017

WP(S) 4785 of 2025

Dharmendra Kumar	29.12.2006
Manoj Kumar Yadav	29.12.2006
Santosh Kumar	29.12.2006
Sushma Kumar	29.09.2006
Awadhesh Kumar	29.12.2006
Md. Nure Alam	22.09.2006
Sudhir Kumar	22.09.2006
Anuj Kumar Singh	24.01.2006
Lalan Prasad	24.01.2006
Umesh Baitha	22.09.2006
Ghanshyam Kumar	01.10.2006
Shahansha Alam	29.12.2007
Sangita Gupta	29.12.2006
Pravesh Ram	29.12.2006
Sanjeet Kumar	22.09.2006
Puspa Kumari	29.09.2006
Mithilesh Kumar Ravi	29.12.2006

WP(S) 4915 of 2025

Abhishek Kumar	24.01.2006
Arun Kumar Vishwakarma	29.12.2006
Kuldip Kumar Yadav	21.07.2017
Binay Kumar Yadav	27.11.2007
Nikhil Ranjan	30.10.2007
Anuj Kumar	24.01.2006
Manoj Rajak	29.12.2006
Ranjit Kumar Singh	24.01.2006
Bhola Prasad Gupta	12.11.2007
Santosh Kumar Pathak	29.12.2006
Vikash Prasad Gupta	29.09.2010
Bajrangi Kumar Gupta	09.08.2009
Krishna Prasad	26.03.2003
Parmeshwar Ram	29.12.2006
22. Guddu Prasad Yadav	21.07.2017
23. Nagendra Kumar Yadav	01.12.2006
24. Rajkishor Kumar	29.12.2006
25. Sadam Husain	29.08.2008
26. Satyendra Prasad	22.09.2006
28.Suresh Yadav	29.08.2007
Mithlesh Kumar	29.08.2008
Raj Kumar Yadav	12.12.2007
Prema Kumari	04.03.2010

Ranjeet Kumar	11.10.2007
Vishvanath Yadav	12.12.2007
Anil Ram	29.08.2007
Arunajay Kumar Singh	12.11.2007
Kamta Prasad	20.01.2005
Ravindra Kumar Yadav	29.12.2006
Binod Vishwkarma	29.08.2007
Ravindra Rajak	29.08.2007
Sarita Kumari	29.12.2006
Birbal Prasad	27.01.2011
Pintu Kumar	29.08.2008
Rakesh Kumar Yadav	30.10.2008
Shivdhyan Singh	29.12.2006
Saryu Thakur	29.12.2006
Ram Vilash Yadav	21.07.2017
Shambhu Yadav	21.07.2017
Rahul Ranjan	29.07.2017
Bashishth Kumar Yadav	21.07.2017
Mithlesh Yadav	30.10.2007
Dimpal Kumari	14.10.2009
Mukesh Kumar	29.12.2006
Savita Kumari	11.10.2007
Santosh Kumar Singh	29.12.2006
Santosh Kumar	29.12.2006

WP(S) 4917 of 2025

Madhu Kumari	25.07.2005
Sunil Kumar	24.10.2006
Santosh Prasad	24.01.2006
Sosan Kachhap	03.11.2007
Satyendra Kumar Singh	03.01.2007
Akhilesh Kumar	03.01.2007
Md. Irfan Ali	07.01.2007
Mithilesh Kumar Yadav	03.01.2007

WP(S) 5080 of 2025

Sudama Prasad Rajak	24.01.2006
Binod Kumar Singh	24.01.2006
Sachin Kumar Pandey	01.03.2007
Dharmendra Kumar	20.06.2006
Nilam Kumari	07.11.2007
Shriram Choudhary	16.11.2006
Kumari Urmila	12.01.2011
Baijyanti Sharma	10.11.2007
Sunil Kumar Yadav	07.11.2007
Ajeet Kumar	01.11.2006
Niranjan Kumar	21.11.2007
Ashok Kumar Singh	01.12.2006
Amod Kumar Sharma	13.07.2017
Sarita Kumari	13.07.2017
Shiv Shankar Ram	03.01.2007
Pramod Ram	01.11.2006
Upendra Kumar Paswan	24.01.2006
Khurshid Alam	03.01.2007
Satyendra Ram	03.01.2007
Rabina Khatun	05.10.2006
Ashish Kumar Jayswal	11.10.2007

Niranjan Das	07.11.2007
Shweta Gupta	05.08.2017
Surendra Kumar Paswan	03.01.2007
Lalita Kumari	29.01.2006
Sindhu Kumar Yadav	07.01.2008
Dil Mohammad	07.12.2009
Bhishm Narayan Singh	19.12.2012
Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal	07.12.2009
Brij Bhushan Prasad	07.12.2009
Birendra Prasad	07.12.2009
Mobin Ansari	07.12.2009
Wasim Akram	19.12.2012
Abid Ansari	07.12.2009
Akhtar Ansari	07.12.2009
Ramnath Ram	03.01.2007
Kalam Ansari	07.12.2009
Sakim Ansari	30.10.2009
Enamul Haque	30.10.2009
Aphsar Ansari	30.10.2009
Sudama Prasad Yadav	03.01.2007
Ramjit Ram	26.03.2003
Mahendra Kumar Yadav	01.08.2009
Binod Singh	12.11.2007
Upendra Singh	07.12.2009
Vikash Kumar	19.12.2012
Bishwanath Ram	19.08.2008
Pramila Kumari	01.12.2006
Ram Narayan Yadav	27.11.2007
Ajay Ram	06.08.2017
Gita Kumari	05.10.2006
Kausar Ali	07.12.2009
Amarik Yadav	13.07.2017
Mohammad Zafeeruddin	03.01.2007
Mahendra Kumar Yadav	03.01.2007
Manoj Yadav	16.08.2008(I)
Sanaullah	07.12.2009(I)
Gulam Sarwar Ansari	18.09.2007
Saryu Yadav	29.08.2007
Umesh Kumar Singh	03.01.2007
Premchand Kumar	21.11.2007
Rambha Kumari	25.12.2012
Arun Kumar Yadav	21.11.2007
Om Prakash Gupta	03.01.2007
Pramod Choudhary	23.08.2008
Shiv Pujan Prasad	18.09.2007
Sanjay Kumar Singh	03.11.2007
Sanjay Ram	16.11.2004
Suresh Yadav	03.01.2007
172. Satyendra Paswan	07.11.2007

18. Mr. Gadodia submitted that the RTI reply dated 8.7.2015, strengthens his contention that the impugned order has been passed on the basis of conjunctures, as in the reply to an application preferred under the Right to

Information Act, 2005, it has been categorically stated that no list pertaining to the recommendations made by the block-level committee is present at the block office.

19. It is next contended that the first appellate authority has passed the impugned order without considering the recommendation made in the 64th committee meeting. He submits that the impugned order violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India, as even the case of the petitioner also ought to be treated as a special case as, even if the grounds taken in the impugned order are accepted, the same would only amount to a procedural lacuna and would not make the appointment itself illegal, especially in light of the fact that the petitioners possessed the required eligibility criteria at the time of their appointment.

20. In order to buttress his arguments further, the Ld. Counsel representing the petitioner has relied in the case of ***Shankar Ghosh v. State of Jharkhand and Ors*** **(MANU/JH/0013/2010)**, wherein the Hon'ble Court had held that long-term services cannot be terminated on the basis of allegations that the appointment process was not followed. Drawing strength from the order passed in the case of ***Arjun Singh v. State of Jharkhand and Ors*** reported in ***(2017 (2) JLJR 647),*** the Ld. counsel representing the petitioner submits that the employee cannot be penalized if any document which ought to be in the custody of the employer is not produced or goes missing.

21. He lastly submits that the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Gaurav Mehla and Ors v. State of Haryana and Ors*** reported in **(2026 SCCOnline SC 1107**), has divided any recruitment process into three distinct stages, which are- issuance of proper advertisement, conducting a fair and transparent selection process, and appointment by a competent authority. The Hon'ble Apex Court has held that when the first two stages, that is, issuance of proper advertisement and conducting a fair and transparent selection process, are done properly, any discrepancy in appointment by a competent authority cannot go into the root of the recruitment process itself, and would not vitiate, more so when such persons have already served for a long time.

Submission by Respondent-JEPC.

22. *Per contra*, Mr. Krishna Murari, Ld. Counsel representing the Respondent-JEPC, vehemently opposed the relief sought by the petitioners on the ground of maintainability of the writ petition itself. He submitted that petitioners ought to have approached the second appellate authority, that is, the State Project Director, in terms of Rule 16 of the *Jharkhand Assistant Teacher Service Rules, 2021*. He submits that in the presence of an alternate and efficacious remedy, this court cannot exercise its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. In order to further buttress his argument, he has relied on the case of ***Leelawati N. and Ors v. State of Karnataka and Ors*** reported in ***(2025 SCC Online SC 2253).*** The respondents have filed a specific interlocutory application with respect to the same.

23. Learned counsel representing the Respondent further submits that, even otherwise, this Court cannot look into the soundness of the decision, but can only see if proper procedure has been followed. This argument has been strengthened by him relying on the case of ***Bharat Coking Coal Limited and Ors v. AMR Dev Prabha and Ors*** reported in ***(2020) 16 SCC 759.***

24. As far as the merits of the case are concerned, the Ld. counsel on behalf of the respondent submits that block-level recommendations are mandatory, and in the case of the petitioner, such block-level recommendation was lacking. This aspect of the matter, according to the petitioner, has been long settled by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***Usha Kumari and Ors v. State of Jharkhand and Ors (LPA No. 151 of 2018).***

25. Respondents further submitted that the petitioners are persons who did not possess the requisite qualification at the time of their appointment, and also due procedure was not followed. In such cases, no sympathy is warranted to the Petitioners. The Ld. Counsel has relied on the case of ***State of Orissa and Anr v. Mamta Mohanty*** reported in ***(2011) 3 SCC 436***, where the Hon'ble Apex Court held that education connotes the process of training and developing the knowledge, skills, minds, and character of students by formal schools. As the excellence of instruction provided by an educational institution mainly depends directly on the excellence of the teaching staff, it is important that they

themselves possess a good academic record/minimum qualification prescribed as an eligibility standard, failing which education cannot be maintained.

Rejoinder by the Petitioner

26. Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner in reply had submitted that there is a distinction between entertainability and maintainability of a writ petition. The exhaustion of statutory remedy is a rule of judicial policy and discretion, rather than an absolute judicial bar to the exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. He categorically submits that where the action by a subordinate authority is perverse, unreasonable, and suffers from a manifest error going to the very root of determination, then, in such a case, the self-imposed restriction of an alternate remedy would not apply. He submits that, in the case at hand, the impugned orders were passed without taking into consideration vital documents such as the verified and uploaded records in the *e-vidyavahini* portal, which leave no doubt that the petitioners' appointment were approved from the block-level committee. Once it is established that vital evidence, which must have been considered by the authority, has been overlooked, then, in such a case, the impugned order would suffer from manifest error and perversity, leaving it open for this Court to entertain the writ petition.

27. He further submits that the alternative remedy proposed should also be efficacious. In the case at hand, the second appellate authority is the State Project Director who has already disclosed his mind as being a member of not only the 64th committee meeting held on 10.7.2023 but also the authority that had discontinued the services of the petitioner, pending a decision from the disciplinary cum administrative authority. Thus, it is submitted by the petitioner that relegating the petitioner to the alternate statutory remedy would not be efficacious.

28. It is next submitted that the block-level recommendation, even if mandatory and not made, cannot be a ground to terminate the services of the petitioner after a lapse of more than 20 years. More so, in light of the fact that the petitioners possess all requisite qualifications and there are no instances of any complaints as against the petitioners in discharge of their duties.

Discussion and Finding.

29. Having heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the records, the issues for the adjudication of these petitions is carved as under:

(i) *Whether the instant petition is maintainable in view of an alternative statutory remedy under Rule 16 of the Jharkhand Assistant Teacher Service Rules, 2021?*

(ii) *Whether the impugned order is illegal, arbitrary and suffers from perversity?*

30. Coming to the first issue, that is, the maintainability of the instant writ petition, the Ld. Counsel for the respondent-JEPC has seriously objected to the maintainability of the instant writ petition on the ground of an alternate and efficacious statutory remedy being present. His submission is primarily based on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Leelawati N. and Ors v. State of Karnataka and Ors*** reported in **(*2025 SCC Online SC 2253).***

31. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in the above-mentioned case, relegated the parties to the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal while returning a finding that such tribunals are the primary authority vested with the jurisdiction to hear matters pertaining to recruitment in light of the judgment rendered in the case of ***L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India (1997) 3 SCC 261.***

32. The submission of the Ld. counsel of the respondent-JEPC seems to hold water, at first sight; however, this Court cannot lose sight of the arguments advanced by the Ld. counsel for the petitioners. The question about the limits of the jurisdiction of the High Courts in issuing a writ under Article 226 has been frequently considered by the Hon'ble Apex Court, and the same is no longer in doubt. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Syed Yakub v. K.S Radhakrishnan and Ors*** reported in ***(1964) 5 SCR 64***, has held that once it is established that an order impugned suffers from manifest error or perversity, the plea of alternative remedy would not come to the aid of the respondents.

33. Thus, once manifest error or perversity is established, this Court has a constitutional duty to correct such perversity or manifest error by exercising

its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The term "perversity" has been defined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***PSA Sical Terminals Private Limited v. The Board of Trustees of VO Chidambranar Port Trust, Tutikorin and Ors*** reported in ***(2021 INSC 365)***, to mean a case *"when a finding is based on no evidence, or a finding is based on taking into account something irrelevant, or vital evidence in arriving at its decision has been ignored, then a decision can be said to be perverse."*

34. On the basis of the submissions of the parties, it is apparent that the services of the petitioners were terminated for want of recommendations by the block-level committee. The impugned order records the services of some of the petitioners were terminated on account of their failure to submit the block-level recommendations. In some cases where the petitioners submitted the block-level recommendations, the same did not tally with the records in the block office, or there were no records found in the block office altogether.

35. The respondent has never disputed the records as contained in the *e-vidyavahini* portal. The said record, unambiguously reflects that the appointments were made, that the petitioners were appointed after following due process of law, and there was a recommendation by the Gram Sabha, which was approved by the block-level office. Further, the records clearly reveal that the petitioners were not only inducted into service after approval by the competent authority but were further given induction training and continued in the service of the respondent.

36. This report generated by the respondents has not been considered by the First Appellate Authority. The impugned order further fails to reflect any consideration by the authority with respect to the proposals/recommendation made by JEPC in its 64th meeting. Such non-consideration of vital evidence would not only make the impugned order suffer from manifest error, but also make the order perverse. Once such perversity is prima facie established, this court can exercise its jurisdiction under Article 226 to further examine as to whether any interference is warranted.

37. This Court further finds force in the alternative argument advanced by the Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner, that the statutory remedy would no longer

be efficacious. The Second Appellate Authority in the case at hand is the State Project Director, who seems to have already disclosed his mind, while issuing the order dated 13.10.2023, by which the Petitioners were restrained to disclose their duties and their honorarium/salary was stopped, subject to the decision of the disciplinary cum administrative authority.

38. The State Project Director is the head of Respondent-JEPC and admittedly, it was the decision of JEPC to challenge the order passed by the disciplinary cum administrative authority, which was in favour of the petitioners.

39. The principle that *'Justice should not only be done but also seem to have been done',* is an important aspect of the judicial system of this country. Once the second Appellate authority disclosed his mind by restraining the petitioners to discharge their duties and stopping their honorarium/salary and further appealing the order of the disciplinary cum administrative authority; then relegating the Petitioners to this authority would be an empty formality. It would essentially be a case of appeal from Caesar to Caesar's wife. In such cases, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held, as in the case of, ***Dhampur Sugar Mills Limited v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors*** reported in ***(2007) 8 SCC 338*****,** that, alternate remedy would not be a bar in exercise of the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

40. This also distinguishes these cases from that of ***Leelawati N. and Ors v. State of Karnataka and Ors*** reported in **(*2025 SCCOnline SC 2253),*** which dismissed the writ petitions on the ground of an alternative remedy available in the form of the State Administrative Tribunal. However, in this case, no such independent tribunal has jurisdiction to look into the grievances of the petitioners. The issue is accordingly decided in favour of the petitioner.

41. As a consequence, the interlocutory applications raising the issue of maintainability also stands dismissed.

42. The next issue pertains to the legality of the impugned order. The impugned order dated 16.01.2025 is divided into and contains 8 annexures. The instant batch of writ petitions is in connection with Annexures C, D, E, and F. Annexures C and D are para-teachers of Naudiah Bazar and Chhatarpur,

respectively, who had provided the block recommendations available with them to the respondents. However, these recommendations did not tally with the records. The respondent therefore considered this to be an absence of the block-level recommendations itself.

43. Annexures E and F are para-teachers of Naudiah Bazar and Chhatrapur, respectively, and are such persons who could not provide any block-level recommendations to the Respondent. The respondents have terminated their service, as no records pertaining to such recommendations could be found by them.

44. The primary contention raised by the petitioners in this respect is that it is not the duty of the petitioners to maintain or keep a record of the block-level recommendation. Rather, these records is to be maintained by the respondents themselves. The respondent in a reply to an application filed under the Right to Information Act, 2005, dated 8.7.2015, has already held that no such list is available at the block-level office/center (Annexure SA/1). Moreso, the records obtained from the *e-vidyavahini* portal and attached as part of the instant petition show that respondents accepted that approvals were made by the block-level committee and the petitioners had undergone induction training. He submits that all the petitioners entered into an agreement, and for more than 16 years, an honorarium was paid to them by the respondents.

45. This Court is of the firm view that in case the records have gone missing or do not tally with the records submitted by the petitioners, the petitioners cannot be penalized for the same, especially in light of the fact that the duty to maintain such records is with the respondents and not the petitioner.

46. As already indicated above that *e-vidyavahini* portal, which contains the service details of the petitioners, is admittedly maintained by the respondents, and no malpractice has been alleged against any of the petitioners regarding entries of their names and details in the said portal.

47. The lynchpin of this issue rests on who was responsible for maintenance of the recommendations made by the block-level committee. The letter dated 26.7.2019 (page 145), issued to the member of the special committee constituted by the *Vidhan Sabha*, categorically records an admission

that the onus to maintain the block-level recommendation is the duty of the Block Education Officer or the District Superintendent of Education.

48. Even otherwise, the candidate selected by the Aam Sabha had no role to play in the said recommendation, and as such, they cannot be held responsible for maintaining documents pertaining to such recommendation.

49. The chart submitted by the petitioner, which is based on the data obtained from the *e-vidyavahini* portal, further supplements this fact, beyond any doubt that verification of block-level recommendations of the petitioner had taken place had been uploaded/updated on the portal.

50. This Court in the case of ***Abhay Prasad v. State of Jharkhand*** reported in ***(2005 (1) JCR 167 (Jhr),*** held that a person, even if initially appointed on a temporary/contractual basis, who continues to work for 17-18 years, cannot be thrown out on the street only on the basis of conjuncture that the appointment of the person was illegal. This Court has, in the case of ***Shankar Ghosh v. State of Jharkhand (MANU/JH/0013/2010),*** held that after prolonged service, the services of the petitioner cannot be terminated on the ground that it was illegal and not done in accordance with law. More recently, in the case of ***Arjun Singh v. State of Jharkhand*** reported in ***(2017 (2) JLJR 647),*** this Court has held that prolonged service cannot be terminated on the ground that documents of which the employer was custodian were not produced or had gone missing as it is to be presumed that the appointment and continued service were after proper verification.

51. Once it is established that the duty to maintain the documents pertaining to block-level recommendation was that of the respondents, and in the past such verifications were undertaken, it would be illegal to terminate the services of the petitioner on this ground alone. This Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the updated data from the *e-vidyavahini* portal, is a vital document and has not been considered in the impugned order.

52. The argument of the respondents that illegal appointment cannot be allowed to continue, especially when block-level recommendation was mandatory as per the notification of *Sarva Siksha Abhiyan* as well as the *Assistant Teacher Service Rules, 2021*, is also not tenable in light of the

judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Gaurav Mehla and Ors v. State of Haryana and Ors (2026 SCCOnline SC 1107)***. The Hon'ble Apex Court was examining the appointments of the appellants (therein), to the post of Clerk-cum-Salesman and Poen-cum-Chaukidar in Thanesar Co-operating Marketing-cum-Processing Society Limited, Kurukshetra. The appointments were made in terms of the Primary Cooperative Marketing Processing Society Limited's Staff Service Rules, 2003, which contain the mandatory requirement for the recommendation to be made by the Assistant Registrar Cooperative Society, Inspector Cooperative Society, and District Manager. Such recommendation was absent in the case of the appellants.

53. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that any process of recruitment can be divided into three categories, *i.e, issuance of proper advertisement, conducting a fair and transparent selection process, and appointment by the competent authority*. A recruitment process would not stand vitiated if it would not go to the root of the matter, i.e., if proper advertisement was made and a fair and transparent selection process was carried out.

54. In the case at hand, there is no dispute that proper advertisements were issued, and pursuant to such advertisement, the names of the petitioners were recommended by the *Aam* Sabha. After the recommendation, an agreement was executed by and between the petitioners and the competent authority. As such, even if it is admitted that block-level recommendation was absent, such absence of block-level recommendation would not go to the root of the matter.

55. Lastly, the argument of the respondents that the petitioners did not have the requisite eligibility criteria does not hold water as such; persons who did not possess the requisite qualifications have been put in a separate category and form part of Annexures G and H of the impugned order. The argument of the respondents that the petitioners did not meet the eligibility criteria at the time of their appointment is not at all reflected in the impugned order. It is established law that the respondent cannot substantiate or add reasons to the impugned order in the shape of an affidavit or otherwise. This principle is well

enunciated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Mohindhr Singh Gill and Anr v. Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi (1978) 1 SCC 405.*** The issue is accordingly decided in favour of the petitioners.

56. *In sequitur*, the impugned order, is, hereby quashed and set aside and the Petitioners shall be reinstated in service with immediate effect. From the record, it would further transpire that even during the pendency of the decision to be taken by the disciplinary-cum-administrative authority, the petitioners were restrained from discharging their duties and were not even paid honorarium/salary. Ultimately, the disciplinary-cum-administrative authority held that the petitioners were validly appointed, vide orders dated 13.03.2024 and 27.04.2024. Despite this, the petitioners were not allowed to resume their duties. Thus, the principle of *'no work no pay'* would not be applicable, in the given facts and circumstances of the case.

57. In view of the cumulative effects, it is hereby ordered that the petitioners would be paid the entire salary/honorarium with effect from 13.03.2024 and 27.04.2024, that is the date on which the disciplinary or administrative authority held in favour of the petitioner, till the date of the reinstatement. The said people would be treated as continuing in service with all consequential benefits.

58. The concerned respondent is accordingly directed to issue necessary order permitting the respective petitioners to rejoin services forthwith, but in any case, not beyond a period of 4 weeks, from the date of receipt/production of copy of this order. However, the direction regarding payment of honorarium/salary for the intervening period and other consequential benefits so attached shall be complied with within a further period of 8 weeks.

59. The writ petitions accordingly stand allowed. Pending I.As, if any, also stand closed. Parties to bear their own cost.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

Dated: 04 / 11/2026
Amardeep/
A.F.R
Uploaded
5.11.2026