IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11252 of 2025

==========

1. Preeti Kumari W/o- Nikesh Kumar, Resident of- Flat No. 104., Keshav-Malti Enclave, Police Colony, P.O- Ashiyana Nagar, PS- Rajeev Nagar, Patna-800025.
2. Khushboo Kumari D/o- Late Ram Suresh Rai, Resident of Vill- Raghurampur, PO- Chandmari, PS- Shapur, Danapur Cant, Patna, Pin- 801503.
3. Pratibha D/o Shashi Bhushan Sharma, Resident of Vill- Bisautha, PO- Dhanaura, PS- Katra, Distt- Muzaffarpur, Bihar, Pin- 843321.
4. Rekha Kumari D/o- Rambali Thakur, Resident of Vill- Korbabha, PO- Laguniya Suryakanth, PS and Distt- Samastipur, Bihar, Pin- 848101.
5. Premlata Kumari D/o Siyaram Pd. Singh, Resident of Chicknauta M G Nagar, Ward No. 31,. PO-Hajipur, PS- Hajipur City, Distt- Vaishali, Bihar, Pin- 844101.
6. Jagriti Kumari D/o Rajesh Kumar Singh, Resident of Ramayan Lane, New Jaganpura Road, PO- Jaganpura, PS- Ramkrishna Nagar, Patna- 800027.
7. Nitu Kumari D/o Ram Uchit Rai, Resident of Indrapuri Road No. 03(A), PO- Keshari Nagar, PS- Patliputra, Patna- 800024.
8. Jai Prakash Narayan S/o Mahendra Rai, Resident of Muhalla- Mision Motihari, PO- Pataura, PS- Mufassil Motihari, East Champaran, Bihar, Pin- 845402.
9. Amrita Chandra D/O Akhauri Umesh Chandra Sinha, resident of hope mahendra apartment, flat no-c/209, Munna Chak, P.S.-Kankarbagh Patna city, Patna, pin-800020.
10. Masudan Kumar S/o Chandi Paswan, Resident of Vill- Bhikhari ghat, PO- Budhwa, PS- Alauli, Distt- Khagaria, Pin- 848203.
11. Santosh Kumar S/o Mahendra Prasad Yadav, Resident of Vill and PO- Belahiya, PS- Darpa, Distt- East Champaran, Bihar, Pin- 845301.
12. Ritu Rani D/o Sukhdeo Pd. Keshari, Resident of Vill and PO- Baidrabad, PS- Arwal, Distt- Arwal, Bihar, Pin- 804402.
13. Nirupama Kumari D/o- Subhash Choudhary, Resident of Vill, PO, PS and Buxar, Bihar, Pin-802101.
14. Rajesh Kumar Jaiswal S/o Bhagyanarayan Pd. Jaiswal, Resident of Vill, PO and PS- Bhopatpur, Distt- East Champaran, Bihar, Pin- 845432.
15. Niraj Kumar S/o Sheo Kumar Singh, Resident of Vill- Karhara, PO- Sehra, PS- Sigori, Distt- Patna, Bihar, Pin- 801110.
16. Md. Kalim Ansari S/o Md. Kaimuddin Ansari, Resident of Vill- Shivpur, PO- Birpur, PS- Shahpur, Distt- Bhojpur, Bihar, Pin- 802165.
17. Kumari Anita Sharma D/o Madan Sharma, Resident of Vill, PO and PS- Mohania, Distt- Kaimur, Bihar, Pin- 821109.
18. Anita Kumari D/o Nirmal Pd. Gupta, Resident of Vill- Punpun Bazar, PO and PS- Punpun, Distt- Patna, Bihar, Pin -804453.

19. Amrita Kumari D/o Parasnath, Resident of Vill- Simli Chhoti Mandir main road, PS- Patna City, Distt- Patna, Bihar. Pin- 800008.
20. Sanjeev Kumar S/o late Ashok Kumar Gupta, Resident of Vill-Janarh, PS-Aurai, Distt- Muzaffarpur, Bihar, Pin-843317.
21. Amarkant Bhagat S/o Mahant Bhagar, Resident of Vill- Lakhanpur, PO-Angoan, PS- Katra, Distt- Muzaffarpur, Bihar, Pin- 843360.
22. Md. Aftab Firoz S/o Md. Firoz Alam, Resident of Vill- Mahisakol, PO-Bansbari, PS and Distt- Araria, Bihar, Pin- 854311.
23. Sudha Roy D/o Shilanath Roy, Resident of Vill and PS- Rahimapur, PS-Bidupur, Distt- Vaishali, Bihar, Pin- 844502.
24. Anil Kumar Singh @ Anil Kumar S/o Pradip Singh, Resident of Vill-Rampur, PO- Rampur Brahmpurdas, PS- Rajapakar, Distt- Vaishali, Bihar, Pin- 844504.
25. Manoj Kumar S/o Harendra Singh, Residing at- Village Gaya Ghat, Post Office-Asha Parki, District- Buxar, PIN- 802135.
26. Susri Madhuri D/o- Rajendra Prasad Sinha, Residing at Jamsari P.O, P.S.-Bind Block Bind, District - Nalanda, Pin- 803107
27. Priyanka Kumari D/o Sachidanand Tiwari, Residing at ward No. 8 (Saraiya Khurda), matiyariya, Post- makhuya, Manikpur, East Champaran, Manikpur, Bihar- 845437.
28. Ranju Kumari D/o- Hira Prasad, Residing at Mansur Nagar, P.O. - Sohsaray, P.S. - Sohsaray, District - Nalanda, Pin - 803118.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna through its Secretary.
4. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11508 of 2025

==========

1. Ram Naresh Singh S/o Chathu Singh @ Chhathu Singh, Resident of Village-Harpur Hari, P.O. - Shahwajpur Puraina, P.S.- Harlochanpur Suky, Dist. - Vaishali (Bihar).
2. Pankaj Kumar, S/o - Chandeshwar Ram, Resident of Village- Mahua Singh Rae, P.O.- Mahua, P.S.- Mahua, Dist. - Vaishali (Bihar).
3. Shyam Sundar Prasad Dhiraj, S/o Bhikhar Yadav, Resident of village- Dal

Bigha, P.O.- Latta, P.S.- Pauthu, Dist.- Aurangabad (Bihar).

4. Deepak Kumar Bharti, S/o Lalan Kumar Singh, Resident of Mohalla- Punjabi Colony, Gali No.- 01, Dharampur, Ward No. 26, P.O. - Samastipur, P.S.- Samastipur Town, Dist. - Samastipur (Bihar).
5. Hiralal Sah Gond, S/o - Dhaneshwar Sah, Resident of Village- Amnaura, P.O. - Tiyay, P.S. - Ander, Dist. - Siwan (Bihar).
6. Hemlata Kumari Gupta, D/o- Late Prahalad Prasad, W/o- Subhash Kumar, Resident of -Radhika Sadan, P.G.S More Raj Nagar, Khagaul Road, Near Electric Office, P.O.- Danapur Cantt., P.S.- Danapur, Dist. - Patna (Bihar).
7. Sweety Kumari, D/o Late Uday Narayan Prasad, W/o- Late Anil Kumar Gupta, Resident of Village- Nokha, Ward No. - 10, Sarvoday Nagar, P.O.- Nokha, P.S. - Nokha, Dist.- Rohtas at Sasaram (Bihar).
8. Baby Kumari, D/o- Manna Saw, W/o- Arun Kumar Gupta, Resident of Mohalla- Malgodam, Professor Colony, Nawada, P.O.- Nawada, P.S. - Nawada, Dist.- Nawada (Bihar).
9. Anand Kumar, S/o - Late Rajendra Roy, Resident of Village- Tajpur Buzurg, P.O.- Bishanpur Bejha, P.S. - Mahua, Dist.- Vaishali (Bihar).

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12106 of 2025

==========

Rajesh Kumar Son of Dukha Thakur, Resident of the village and P.O.- Ghosaut, P.S.- Sivaipatti in the district of Muzaffarpur (Bihar).

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Primary Education, New Secretariat, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Regional Deputy Director, Primary Education, Muzaffarpur, (Govt. of Bihar).
4. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Education Officer, Muzaffarpur.
6. The District Programme Officer, Muzaffarpur.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12142 of 2025

==========

1. Navendu Sarthy S/o - Devendra Prasad, Resident of Mohalla- Ward No.- 15, Gayatri Mandir, P.O.- Hanumat Nagar, P.S.- Araria, Dist.- Araria (Bihar).
2. Vijay Kumar, S/o Ramadhar Singh, Resident of village- Arvind Nagar, Sitalpur, P.O. - Arvind Nagar, P.S.- Dariyapur, Dist.- Saran (Bihar).
3. Sangeeta Kumari, W/o Rahul Singh, Resident of 41, Kamla Apartment, Road No. 10, Nearby Arya Apartment, East Patel Nagar, L.B.S. Nagar, P.O.- Shastri Nagar, PS.- Shastri Nagar, Dist. - Patna (Bihar).
4. Rani Kumari, W/o Sanjay Kumar Singh, Resident of C/o Capt. B.P. Singh, Urja Nagar, P.O. - Danapur, P.S.- Danapur, Dist. - Patna (Bihar).
5. Priyanka Kumari, W/o Bhikhar Yadav, R/o Village-Dal Bigha, P.O. Latta, P.S. Pauthu, District-Aurangabad (Bihar).
6. Chandrakala Kumari, D/o- Laddu Lal Bhagat, Resident of village- Karua Rupni, P.O. - Chautham, P.S.- Chautham, Dist. - Khagaria (Bihar).
7. Saroj Kumar, S/o- Rajendra Ray, Resident of village- Mohammadpur Dharm @ Maruanha, P.O.- Katesar, P.S.- Sakra, Dist.- Muzaffarpur (Bihar).
8. Manju Kumari, W/o Binod Kumar, Resident of village- Ramnagar Chakdara, P.O. - Nilkanthpur, P.S.- Mahua, Dist.- Vaishali (Bihar).
9. Tanya Suman, W/o Ranjeet Kumar Verma, Resident of Krishna Kunj Near Tapovan School, Maurya Vihar, Transport Nagar Kumhrar, P.O. - Bahadurpur, P.S.- Agamkuan, Dist. - Patna (Bihar).
10. Rani Kumari, W/o- Saroj Kumar, Resident of Village- Rajapakar, P.O - Rajapakar, P.S.- Sakra, Dist.- Muzaffarpur (Bihar).
11. Rajesh Paswan, S/o- Satyanarayan Paswan, Resident of Ward No.- 4, Govindpur Bela, P.O.- Baligoun, P.S.- Govindpur Bela, Dist. - Vaishali (Bihar)
12. Rajesh Kumar Ranjan, S/o Sakaldip Paswan, Resident of Mohalla- Prabhat Colony, P.O. - Line Bazar Purnia, P.S.- K. Hat, Dist. - Purnia, (Bihar).
13. Rajesh Paswan, S/o- Singheshwar Paswan, Resident of Mohalla- Naya Tola, Rambagh, P.O. - Purnia, P.S. - Sadar Thana Purnia, Dist. - Purnia (Bihar).
14. Preeti Kumari, D/o Jagdish Prasad, Resident of Village- Rajpur, P.O.- Rajpur, P.S.- Rajpur, Dist. - Rohtas (Bihar).

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12213 of 2025

==========

1. Sarita Kumari W/o- Pankaj Kumar Singh Resident of Village- Kanausi, Begusarai, P.O.- Dunahi, P.S.- Garhpura, District - Begusarai, Bihar.
2. Sanjeev Kumar, S/o- Ganesh Prasad Mukhiya, Residing at Mohalla- Ward No.- 12, Machhara Kachari, Tola Kabachua, Machhara, Khagaria, P.O.- Alauli, P.S.- Bahadurpur, District- Khagaria, Bihar.
3. Bambam Kumar Jha, S/o- Rajendra Jha, Resident at 44, Sansarpur Khagaria, P.O.- Amni, P.S.- Mansi, District- Khagaria, Bihar.
4. Shabnam Ara Ansari, W/o- Md. Idrish Ansari, Resident of Mohalla, Mehadi Nagar, Bankat, VTC Baruraj, P.O.- Baruraj, P.S.- Baruraj, District- Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
5. Savita Kumari, W/o- Sanjeev Kumar, Resident at Ward No.- 12, Machhara Kachari, Tola Kabachua, Machhara, Khagaria, P.O.- Alauli. P.S.- Alauli, District- Khagaria, Bihar.
6. Rashmi Singh, W/o- Satyendra Kumar, Resident of Opposite Indira Nagar, Road No.- 3, Vishnupuri Niwas, South Postal Park, P.O.- Patna G.P.O., P.S.- Kankarbagh Police Station, District - Patna, Bihar.
7. Vandita, W/o- Shivarshai Thakur Mukesh, Resident of House No.- 47, V.C. Gali, Mithanpura, Mushahri, P.O. Ramna, P.S.- Mushari Police Station, District - Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
8. Priti Kumari, D/o- Arun Kumar Singh, Resident of Ward no.- 10, Pagra, Kesariya Police Station P.S.- Dalsinghsarai, Pagra, District - Samastipur, Bihar.
9. Meera Kumari, W/o- Umesh Kumar Ram, Resident of- Ward no.- 4, Barma, P.O.- Berma, P.S.- Jhanjharpur, District - Madhubani, Bihar.
10. Khushboo Kumari, D/o- Ramanand Gupta Resident of Village- Falka, P.O.- Falka, P.S.- Falka, Katihar, District- Katihar, Bihar.
11. Aashiyana Perween, W/o- Md. Shamsher, Resident of Village- Karichak, Ward No.- 12, P.O.- Chhapki, P.S.- Virpur, District- Begusarai, Bihar.
12. Swati Kumari, D/O Awadh Bihari Singh, Resident of Village Bajitpur, P.O. - Jehanabad, P.S.- Makhdumpur, Bihar.
13. Nawal Kishor Prasad, S/O Ramayodhya Prasad, Resident of Village Siswa Maldahiya, P.O.- Siswa Bazar, P.S.- Pahadpur, District - East Champaran, Bihar.
14. Daulat Ali, S/O Abdul Khalique, Resident of Village Manglapur, Kalyanpur, P.O.- Kalyanpur, P.S. - Kalyanpur, District - East Champaran, Bihar.
15. Zeba Kousar @ Ziba Kousar W/O Md. Fahim Uddin Ansari, Resident of Village- Rigori, Paligan, P.O. -Sigori, P.S.- Sigori District - Patna, Bihar.
16. Ranjita Kumari, W/O Kanhaiya Tiwary, Resident of Village Chandwa, Bampali P.O - Chandwa, Bampali, P.S. - Nawada, District - Bhojpur, Bihar.

17. Marya Saman, W/O Kamran Khan, Resident of Village Moazzamchak, Habibpur, Mozamchak, P.O - Habibpur, P.S.- Habibpur, District - Bhagalpur, Bihar.
18. Dipti Kumari, W/O Rajeev Kumar Chaudhary, Resident of Marahiya, P.O.- Mira Mushehri, P.S.- Chapra Muffsil, District - Saran, Bihar.
19. Anamika, D/O Ramanand Singh, Resident of - 45, Ward - 02, Near Maiasthan, Vill.- Purushottampur, Parkhotimpur, P.O - A. Purushotampur, P.S. - Mithunpura, District- Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
20. Anita Sinha, W/O- Binod Kumar Sinha, Resident of - House No.- 294B, Ankit Anjali Kunj, Maharaj Colony, Pankha Toli Musahri, Ramna, P.O. Ramna, P.S - Mithunpura, Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
21. Rumana Abbas, D/O - Syed Ali Abbas, Resident of Khalasi Tola, Near Uma Petrol Pump, Old City Court, Patna City, P.O.- Gulzarbagh, P.S.- Paijawa, Patna, Bihar.
22. Rajesh Kumar Keshri, S/O - Late Kedar Prasad Keshri, Resident of - Near Station Road, Nagar Panchayat Bakhri, Ward No. -10, Bakhri, P.O.- B. Bazar, P.S.- Bakhri, District - Begusarai, Bihar.
23. Taruna Kumari, W/O Rabindra Kumar, Resident of Kharkhra, Kosra, Sheikhpura, P.O- Jiyan Bigah, P.S.- Sheikhpura, District- Sheikhpura, Bihar.
24. Suman Gupta, D/O Salik Prasad, Resident of Village- Satowantti, Chaprang, P.O Chaprang Ewati, P.S- Akhini, District - Kaimur, Bihar.
25. Khushboo Priya, W/O Shashi Shekhar Mishra, Resident of Kharahiya Basti, Ward no.- 10, P.O.- Araria Bairgachhi, P.S. - Araria MDEG, District-Araria, Bihar.
26. Anita Kumari, W/O Mithlesh Ram, Resident of Ward No.- 1, Mainapatti, VTC Maheshwara, P.S- Khajauli, P.O- Maheshwara, District- Madhubani, Bihar.
27. Gomati Kumari, W/O Manoj Kumar Jha, Resident of Village Bhit Bhagwanpur, P.O.- Bhit Bhagwanpur, P.S. - Madhepur, District- Madhubani, Bihar.
28. Kumari Shikha, W/O Randhir Kumar, Resident of Village Paunihasanpur, P.O. - Abul Hasanpur, P.S.-Vaishali, District - Vaishali, Bihar.
29. Amrita Kumari, W/O Lalit Kumar Mishra, Resident of Mohalla Ward - 01, Gram - Sugaon Daxini, P.O.- Sugaon, Sugauli, P.S. - Barauli, District - East Champaran, Bihar.
30. Pammi Kumari, W/O Manish Kumar Priyadarshi, Resident of Village- Tiwari Tola Bangara, P.O - Fulwariya, Sugaoli, P.S. - Barauli, District - East Champaran, Sugaoli, Bihar.
31. Raju Kumar, S/O Umesh Singh, Resident of Mohalla- Birpur Purbi, Ward No. - 10, Begusarai, P.O.- Birpur, P.S. - Birpur, District - Begusarai, Bihar.
32. Santwana Bharti, W/O Raju Kumar, Resident of Mohalla- Birpur, Purbi, Ward No. 10, P.O.- Birpur, P.S- Birpur, District - Begusarai, Bihar.
33. Sujeet Kumar Shandily, S/O Satish Thakur, Resident of Mohalla- Ward No.- 41, Bari Eghu, VTC Mohan Eghu, P.O- Mohanaigh, P.S- Matihani District- Begusarai, Bihar.

34. Amrandra Kumar Sinha, S/O Narendra Kumar Sinha, Resident of Chanakya Nagar, Mahmadpur, Ward No.- 38, Bishunpur, P.O- Badlapura, P.S- Matihani, District- Begusarai, Bihar.

35. Krishna Ballabh Sahay, S/O Rambilash Prasad, Resident of Village- Buxar, P.O - Rukundi Jhikatia, P.S. - Goh, District - Aurangabad, Bihar.

36. Dhiraj Kumar, S/O Ram Bharosh Ram, Resident of Village - Patjilwa, P.O- Chiraia, P.S- Shikharganj, District- East Champaran, Bihar.

37. Pramod Kumar, S/O Ashok Kumar, Resident of Mohalla- Purani Bajar, P.O.- Masaurhi, P.S- Masaurhi, District - Patna, Bihar.

38. Mani Bhushan, S/O Mahendra Ray, Resident of Mohalla - Ward No.- 12, Bheriyahi, Chiraia, P.O- Patjilva, P.S - Chiraia, District - East Champaran, Bihar.

39. Vinita Kumari, D/O Nand Kishore Prasad, Resident of Ramkrishna Prasad Path, Kadamkuan, P.O.- Kadamkuan- P.S. -Gandhi Nagar, District - Patna, Bihar.

40. Sonam, W/O Arjun Kumar, Resident of Village- Kasba Aahar, P.O. - Tajpur, P.S.- Tajpur Samastipur, Bihar.

41. Renu Bala, W/O Uma Shankar Sainy, Resident of V/585 Kailash Bhawan, Bidyapuri Colony, Kankarbagh, P.O.- Bankipur, P.S. - Gopalpur, District - Patna, Bihar.

42. Vishwanath Kumar, S/O Shankar Dayal Singh, Resident of Mohalla Ward No.- 11, Muza, P.O.- Patrahia, P.S. - Patrahia, District - Muzaffarpur, Bihar.

43. Nikhilesh Anand, S/O Randhir Parsad Singh, Resident of Village - Naki, Lohchi, P.O. - Munger Head P.S. - Bariyarpur, District - Munger, Bihar.

44. Ajeet Kumar, S/O Rajshwor Shah, Resident of Mohalla - Ward No.- 7, Chuhari, P.O. - Chuhari, P.S.- Chuhari, District - West Champaran, Bihar.

45. Md. Reyazul Ansari, S/O Md. Fazlur Rahman Ansari, Resident of Village Langri, P.O.- Langri, P.S.- Langri, District - Paschim Champaran, Bihar.

46. Shaesta Tabassum, W/O Md. Irfan Waris, Resident of Village Paliganj, P.O.- Paliganj, P.S.- Paliganj, Patna, Bihar.

47. Uma Shankar Gyani, S/O Brijendra Prasad Sinha, Resident of Village - Selhauri, P.O.- Belhauri, P.S.- Belhauri, District Patna, Bihar.

48. Jay Prakash Yadav, S/O Bhikhari Yadav, Resident of Village- Nenuan, P.O. Nenuan, P.S.- Nenuan, Buxar, Bihar.

49. Shitendra Sharma, S/O Shambhu Sharan Sharma, Resident of Mohalla - Ward no.- 11, Ninga, P.O. Ninga, P.S.- Ninga, District - Begusarai, Bihar.

50. Sachin Kumar, S/O Shivnandan Choudhary, Resident of Ward no.- 5, VTC Ninga, P.O - Ninga, P.S.- Barauni, District - Begusarai, Bihar.

51. Soni Kumari, W/O Manoj Kumar Thakur, Resident of Shiv Mandir, P.O - Ninga, P.S.- Ninga, District - Begusarai, Bihar.

52. Kalpana Kumari, W/O Sanjay Kumar, Resident of Village- Maida, Babhangawan, Begusarai, M. Babhangama, P.O.- Babhangawan, P.S.- Babhangawan, District - Begusarai, Bihar.

53. Archana Kusum, W/O Lalendra Kumar Singh, Resident of Village-

Fatehpur, P.O.- Raghopur, P.S.- Raghopur, District - Vaishali, Bihar.

54. Kanchan Kumari, W/O Dilip Kumar Singh, Resident of Bagen, Raghunathpur, Buxar, Bihar, Pin - 802134.

55. Md. Shahnwaz Alam, S/O Md. Jalauddin, Resident of Barsoi Railway Station, Raghunathpur, VTC- Raghunathpur, P.O. - Barsoighat, Barsoi, District - Katihar, Bihar, Pin- 854317.

56. Nutan Bala, W/O Ritesh Kumar Singh, Resident of Mohalla- Ward No. 5, Mehura, P.O.- Mehura P.S.- Mehura, District - West Champaran, Bihar.

57. Anand Milan, S/O Sh. Vijay Shankar Yadav, Resident of Gamharia, P.O.- Gamharia, P.S.- Gamharia, District - Madhepura, Bihar.

58. Satyendra Kumar, S/O Sh. Lalbabu Chaudhari, P.O.-Sitapar, P.S.- Patilar, District- West Champaran, Bihar.

59. Shweta Sinha, W/O Sh. Kishor Kumar, Resident of Village- Bhaisasur, P.O.- Biharsharif, P.S. - Biharsharif, District Nalanda, Bihar.

60. Riti, W/O Sh. Raj Kumar, Resident of Mohalla- Ward No.- 3, Krishna Nagar, P.O.- Krishna Nagar P.S.- Krishna Nagar, Khagaria, Bihar.

61. Pratosh Ranjan, S/O Chakradhar Prasad Singh, Resident of Mohalla Ward No.- 20, Hazipur, P.O.- Hazipur, P.S.- Khagaria, Distrct - Khagaria, Bihar.

62. Sanjay Kumar Mandal, S/O Tetar Mandal, Bhramarpur, Near Old Post Office, Ward No.- 3, P.O.- Bihpur, P.S.- Bihpur, Bhagalpur, Bihar.

63. Dhiraj Kumar, S/O Balmiki Singh, Resident of Mohalla - Ward No.- 14, Pansalla, P.O.- Bhairwar, P.S.- Muffasil, Distrct Begusarai, Bihar.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12219 of 2025

==========

1. Dimpal Kumari D/O Birendra Pratap Singh, R/o Village - Pariyari, P.O. - Mahila, P.S. Kudhani, District - Kaimur.

2. Pratima Kumari D/o Radheshyam Singh, R/o Village Nateyan, P.O. - Nateyan, P.S. Kudra, District - Kaimur.

3. Kamal Kumar Singh S/o Birendra Kumar Singh R/o Village - Pariyari, P.O. - Mahila, P.S. Kudhani, District - Kaimur.

4. Kanchan Kumari D/o Sudama Singh, R/o Village and P.O. - Bhabua, Ward No - 02, P.S. Bhabua, District - Kaimur.

5. Santosh Kumar Singh S/o Bashisth Singh, R/o Village and P.O.- Balia, P.S.-

Amba, District - Aurangabad.

6. Binu Kumari Srivastav D/o Jayendra Prasad, R/o Village and P.O.- Badki Kharari, P.S.- Kargahar, District - Rohtas.
7. Ram Krishna Singh S/o Sheomangal Singh, R/o Village - Reniya, P.O. - Doiyan, P.S. - Kargahar, District - Rohtas.
8. Ambedker Prasad S/o Laljee Ram R/o Village- Naugarh, P.O.- Kharenda, P.S.- Bhagwanpur, District - Kaimur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Regional Deputy Director of Education (R.D.D.E.), Patna Division, District - Patna.
6. The District Education Officer, Kaimur, District Bhabua at Kaimur.
7. The District Education Officer, Aurangabad, District Aurangabad.
8. The District Education Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram, District Rohtas at Sasaram.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12262 of 2025

==========

1. Ranjit Kumar Son of Late Ram Bilas Das Resident of Chakka, Post Jorja, Jurja, Block and PS Baheri, Darbhanga 847101 (Bihar).
2. Raja Yadav Son of Late Ram Ashish Yadav, Resident of Bakarganj Abhanda, P.S.- Laheriasarai, Darbhanga 846001 (Bihar).

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna (Bihar).
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of General Administration, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna (Bihar).

4. The Director, Secondary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna (Bihar).
5. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna (Bihar).

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12306 of 2025

==========

1. Ghanshyam Pandey @ Ghanshyam Kumar Pandey S/o Arvind Kumar Pandey, resident of Ward No. 05,Harpur Rewari, P.O.- Harpur Rewari, District- Samastipur- 848134.
2. Prem Shankar Singh, S/o Prabhu Mahto, resident of Ward 11, Rampur Parori, Rampur Parori, Banchauri, Sitamarhi - 843302.
3. Archana Kumari, W/o Pranay Kumar, resident of Bathua Buzurg, Bathua Buzurg, District- Samastipur, Bihar- 848127.
4. Shashikala Kumari, D/o Chandra Prasad, resident of village- Naubatpur Lotan, District- Nalanda (Bihar) - 803096
5. Imran Alam, S/o Nazir Ahmad, resident of Haripur Majrahi, Haripur Haripur Majrahi, District- Madhubani- 847229.
6. Rakesh Kumar, S/o Ramjanam Thakur, resident of Middle School Mankerawa, Mankerawa, District- East Champaran.
7. Kalpana Kumari, W/o Sunil Kumar Jaiswal, resident of Semapur Bazar, P.O.- Semapur, P.S. - Barari, District- Katihar, Bihar- 854115.
8. Md. Iliyash Ali, S/o Md. Aslam Ali, Resident of -Village and P.O.- Madhurapur, P.S. - Bhawanipur (Bihpur), Narayanpur, P.O.- Narayanpur, District- Bhagalpur - 853203.
9. Asha Devi, W/o Sitaram Ishwar, resident of 00/35, Gudhma, Sarairanjan, District- Samastipur-848127.
10. Akhileshwar Kumar Thakur, S/o Rameshwar Thakur, resident of village- Puranidih, District- East Champaran- 845432.
11. Beby Kumari, W/o Munna Ram, resident of Jaisinghpur Barharwa, South Jaisinghpur, P.O.- Bahrupiya, District- East Champaran - 845437.
12. Md. Javed Sabri, S/o Mustafa Sabri, resident of village- Angarghaat, P.O. and P.S.- Angarghaat, District- Samastipur (Bihar)- 848236.
13. Rajiv Ranjan, S/o Amarnath Prasad, resident of Ward No. 13, Muriyard, Darhia Aadhaar, District- Samastipur- 848134.
14. Jibachh Kumar, S/o Bhagbat Ray, resident of Ward no. 08, Sanokhar, Jagmohra, P.O.- Jagmohra, District- Samastipur - 848207.
15. Mukesh Kumar, S/o Indradeo Prasad, resident of Parawalpur, Badauni, Sonchri, P.O.- Parwalpur, District- Nalanda.
16. Manish Kumar Chaudhary, S/o Manoj Kumar Chaudhary, resident of Bakarganj, Darubhatti Chowk, Laheriasarai, District- Darbhanga- 846001.

17. Ravi Ranjan, S/o Birendra Prasad Singh, resident of Ward No. 06, Near Post Office, Harpur, District- Khagaria.
18. Ranjeet Kumar Raman, S/o Jai Narayan Mandal, resident of Bhikhnoulia, Bithaan, Ward No. - 06, Bithan, District- Samastipur- 848207.
19. Sangita Kumari, W/o Rajdeep Kumar Sinha, resident of Thakurganj, District- Kishanganj- 855108.
20. Ashok Kumar Das, S/o Puran Lal Das, resident of Purandarpur, District- Kishanganj- 855117.
21. Abhishek Kumar, S/o Birendra Mishra, resident of village- Thatiya, P.O. - Shio, District- Muzaffarpur - 843119.
22. Shipu Kumari, W/o Suman Kumar Sinha, resident of Ward No. 03, Kabir Chowk, District- Kishangunj- 855108.
23. Md. Sohail Abbasi, S/o Siddique Abbasi, resident of village and P.O. - Chandrahiya District- East Champaran- 845429.
24. Bisnath Yadav, S/o Nand Lal Yadav, resident of Ward No. 09, Bithan, District- Samastipur - 848207.
25. Rina Roy, W/o Mithilesh Kumar Yadav, resident of Pipra, Pipra, Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj - 841405.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna through its Secretary.
4. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12686 of 2025

==========

Neetu Kumari D/o-Gajendra Prasad Gupta, W/o-Santosh Kumar Resident of Village-Dharohra, P.O.-Khartari, P.S.-Chiraiya, District-East Champaran.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar,

Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12711 of 2025

==========

1. Bindu Kumari W/o Deepak Kumar, Resident of Vashisthpuri, Near Housing Colony Arrah, P.O.-Chandwa, P.S.-Nawada, District-Bhojpur (Bihar).
2. Nisha Kumari, W/o Sanjeet Kumar, Resident of Village-Ishakpur, P.O.-Mahnar, P.S.-Mahnar, District-Vaishali, Bihar.
3. Vijay Kumar Chaudhary, S/o Babu Lal Chaudhary, Resident of Village-Tisiauta, P.O.-Tisiauta, P.S.-Tisiauta, District-Vaishali, Bihar.
4. Kavita Kumari, D/o Arun Kumar Paswan, W/o Suman Kumar, Resident of Kanti Nagar Panchayat, Ward No. 3, P.O.-Kanti, P.S.-Kanti, District-Muzaffarpur, Bihar.
5. Khalique Ahmad, S/o Late Nazmul Hoda, Resident of Village-Lohzira, P.O.-Manjhagarh, P.S.-Manjhagarh, District-Gopalganj, Bihar.
6. Rinku Devi, W/o Manoj Kumar, Resident of Village-Amari, P.O.-Amari, P.S.-Dharhara, District-Munger, Bihar.
7. Akshybar Prasad, S/o Dinanath Sah, Resident of Village-Mathiya, P.O.-Mathiya, P.S.-Darauli, District-Siwan, Bihar.
8. Ashok Paswan, S/o Sita Ram Paswan, Resident of Village and P.O.-Rahimabad, P.S.-NH Bangra, District-Samastipur (Bihar).
9. Abhay Kumar Jha, S/o Ramkrishna Jha, Resident of Village and P.O.-Jhakhra, P.S.-Sarairanjan, District-Samastipur, Bihar.
10. Anil Kumar Jha, S/o Devendra Jha, Resident of Village and P.O.-Jitwarpur Kumhira, P.S.-Sarairanjan, District-Samastipur, Bihar.
11. Sarita Kumari, W/o Sanjeev Narayan, Resident of Aadharpur, Ward No. 8, P.O.-Aadharpur, P.S.-Karpurigram, District-Samastipur, Bihar.
12. Ranjita Kumari, W/o Anup Kumar Gupta, D/o Mahendra Prasad, Resident of Village-Bishunpur, Navlakha Road, P.O.-Mirzapur Bandawar, P.S.-Begusarai, District-Begusarai, Bihar.
13. Ram Kumar, S/o Ram Sunder, Resident of Village-Singiyahi, P.O.-Ladora, P.S.-Kalyanpur, District-Samastipur, Bihar.
14. Kamal Paswan, S/o Kusheshwar Paswan, Resident of Village and P.O.-Mohammadpur Koari, P.S.-Vaini OP, District-Samastipur, Bihar.
15. Dilip Kumar, S/o Kedar Paswan, Resident of Village-Govindpur, P.O.-Govindpur, P.S.-Mansur Chak, District-Begusarai, Bihar.
16. Prem Sakhi Kumari, W/o Arvind Kumar Singh, Resident of Village-Bageshwari, P.O.-Shampur Kachahari, P.S.-Shampur Kachahari, District-Munger, Bihar.
17. Pankaj Kumar Pankaj, S/o Bhubneshwar Yadav, Resident of Near Kankarghat Chowk, Lallu Pokhar, P.O.-Munger, P.S.-Kasim Bazar, District-Munger, Bihar.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12743 of 2025

==========

1. Pushpa Kumari Wife of Sri Navnit Prakash, Resident of Ward No. 18, Kamruddinganj, Bihar Sharif, P.O. and P.S. - Bihar Sharif, District- Nalanda.
2. Roopshree, D/o Shiv Shankar Thakur, Resident of Jalalpur, P.O. and P.S.- Sohsarai, Bihar Sharif, District- Nalanda.
3. Dipinti Kumari, D/o Sudhir Kumar Sharma, Resident of Village and P.O.- Ekangar Dih, P.S. - Ekangar Sarai, District- Nalanda.
4. Lilawati Kumari, W/o Shailendra Kumar, Resident of village- Dharmapur, P.O. and P.S. - Hilsa, District- Nalanda.
5. Priyanka Kumari Mishra, D/o Satya Narain Mishra, Resident of Village- Karhari, P.O. - Charan Kala, P.S. - Maali, District- Aurangabad.
6. Mamta Kumari, D/o Krishna Kumar Singh, Resident of village and P.O. - Amba, P.S.- Rahui, District- Nalanda.
7. Kanaklata Kumari, D/o Arjun Kumar, Resident of Village and P.O. - Pariauna, P.S. - Noorsarai, District- Nalanda.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12752 of 2025

==========

1. Renu Kumari Wife of Sri Sunil Kumar Resident of Simli Nawabganj, Madhav Mills, Malsalami, P.O and P.S.- Malsalami, District- Patna.
2. Sunil Sharma Son of Sri Ramakant Sharma Resident of Village-Balaha,

P.O.-Balaha, P.S. and District-Darbhanga.

3. Jeetendra Sharma Son of Jageshwar Sharma Resident of 189, Near Maa Durga, Samaura, P.O. Usri, P.S. and District-Darbhanga.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12862 of 2025

==========

Kumari Minu Wife of Gangesh Kumar Resident of Village-Amgola Khajurbanni, PS Kaji Mohammadpur, District- Muzaffarpur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12868 of 2025

==========

Madhu Rani Wife of Ranjit Kumar Resident of Village-Jagdishpur Baghnagari, PS-Sakra, District -Muzaffarpur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secrtary Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar,

Patna.

4. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12964 of 2025

==========

Shobha Kumari Wife of Alok Ranjan, Daughter of Harendra Singh, Resident of Village- Pakari Near Post office, P.O.- Jasouli, P.S.- Baruraj, District-Muzaffarpur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Addl. Chief Secretary, Department of Education Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Selection Commission, Patna.
4. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12980 of 2025

==========

Arti Kumari Wife of Yogendra Prasad Sah, Resident of Village -Bakhri Barahi, P.S.-Rajapakar, District-Vaishali.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna through its Secretary.
4. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
5. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13022 of 2025

==========

Arun Kumar S/o Raghunath Thakur, R/o Village and P.O. Gorgama, P.S.- Shahpur Patori, District - Samastipur, at present posted as Exclusive Teacher at Government Primary School Imansaray, Block and P.S.- Shahpur Patori, District - Samastipur.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Bhagalpur Division, District - Bhagalpur.
4. The District Education Officer, Banka, District - Banka.
5. The District Education Officer, Samastipur, District -Samastipur.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

with

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13048 of 2025

==========

Nirmala Kumari D/o Ram Deo Singh, wife of Dhirendra Kumar Singh, Resident of village- Kharahana, P.O.- Kukuraha, P.S.- Itarhi, District- Buxar.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Examination Controller, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
4. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :
(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11252 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhinav Srivastava, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Alok Abhinav, Advocate
		Mr. Gyan Prakash, Advocate
		Ms. Diksha Kumari, Advocate
		Ms. Shreyanshi Raj, Advocate
		Mr. Naman Sherstra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh, AAG-13
		Ms. Yeritika K. Kashyap, AC to AG

		Mr. Navnet Govindam, Advocate
For the B.P.S.C.	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Resp. No.6	:	Ms. Supriya Kumar, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11508 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Nityanand Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Abhishek Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Alok Abhinav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Ms. Yeritika K. Kashyap, AC to AG
		Mr. Navnet Govindam, Advocate
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12106 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shiv Shankar Prasad Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Advocate (02)
		Mr. Sumant Kumar Singh, AC to GA-2
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12142 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Alok Abhinav, Advocate
		Mr. Nityanand Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Abhishek Mishra, Advocate
		Ms. Diksha Kumari, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Mr. Subhash Prasad Singh, GA- 3
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12213 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Alok Abhinav, Advocate
		Mr. Naman Shrestra, Advocate
		Mr. Gyan Prakash, Advocate
		Mr. Deepankar Thakur, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Mr. Subhash Prasad Singh, GA- 3
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12219 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Arinjay Kumar, Advocate
		Md. Danish Quamar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Ms. Yeritika K. Kashyap, AC to AG
		Mr. Navnet Govindam, Advocate
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12262 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. M. P. Dixit, Advocate
		Mr. S. K. Dixit, Advocate
		Mr. Milind Raj Dixit, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (28)
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12306 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jay Karan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Y.P. Sinha, AAG- 7
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12686 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Advocate
		Ms. Chetna, Advocate
		Mr. Sujeet Kumar, Advocate

		Mr. Sonu Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Ms. Yeritika K. Kashyap, AC to AG
		Mr. Navnet Govindam, Advocate
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12711 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Nityanand Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Abhishek Mishra, Advocate
		Mr. Alok Abhinav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (04)
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12743 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate
		Mr. Shyama Kant Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. P. K. Shahi, Advocate General
		Ms. Yeritika K. Kashyap, AC to AG
		Mr. Navnet Govindam, Advocate
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12752 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bipin Bihari Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate
		Mr. Shyama Kant Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Pleader (20)
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12862 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate
		Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Advocate
		Ms. Kumari Anjali, Advocate
		Ms. Chetna, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Mujtabaul Haque, GP- 12
		Mr. Manish Kumar, AC to GP-12
For the BPSC :		Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12868 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Pleader (14)
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12964 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ganesh Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Pleader (13)
		Mr. Ravi Kumar, AC to GP-13
		Mr. Akashay Lal Prasad, AC to GP- 13
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12980 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Advocate
		Mr. Sudhir Kumar Sinha, Advocate
		Mr. Dhirendra Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Advocate (11)
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13022 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Advocate

		Mr. Arinjay Kumar, Advocate
		Md. Danish Quamar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. S. K. Mandal, SC- 3
		Mr. Arjun Prasad, AC to SC- 3
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13048 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Advocate (10)
		Mr. Manoj Kumar Yadav, AC to GA-10
For the BPSC	:	Mr. Sanjay Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar Jha, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
CAV JUDGMENT
Date : 30-08-2025

Heard the learned Advocates for the petitioners and the learned Advocates for the respondents.

2. In the bunch of the writ petitions, there are two sets of writ petitions; one set of teachers are ‘Head Teachers’ and another set of teachers are ‘Head Masters’. Since the issue(s) in these writ petitions are one and identical, with the consent of the parties, all these writ petitions have been heard together and are being disposed off by a common order.

3. For the appreciation, the facts narrated in C.W.J.C. No.11252 of 2025, which deals with the case of Head Teachers and in relation to Head Masters in C.W.J.C. No.12219 of 2025 shall be treated as lead case whereas the counter affidavit filed in the afore-noted C.W.J.C. No.11252 of 2025 duly sworn by the Joint Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar shall be treated as response to all the writ petitions, since the stand of the State is one and identical in all the cases.

4. The 1st set of Teachers were appointed as Head Teachers in primary and elementary schools, pursuant to the examinations conducted by the Bihar Public Service Commission (for short 'the BPSC') under the Advertisement No. 25/2024. Their appointments are governed by the Bihar Elementary Schools Head Teachers Rules, 2024. Similarly the 2nd set of Teachers were appointed as Head Master in Higher/Senior Secondary Schools, pursuant to the Advertisement No.26/2024 duly conducted by the BPSC in terms with Bihar State School Teacher (Appointment, Transfer, Disciplinary Proceedings and Service Conditions) Rules, 2023.

5. Based upon the performance of the candidates, in the process of selection undertaken by the BPSC, a merit list in respect of the candidates were prepared, on being found them successful. While the exercise of counselling and the verification of the credentials were in process, in the meanwhile, on 02.01.2025, the Director, Primary Education, issued letter to all the District Education Officers across the State of Bihar instructing them that all the successful candidates for the post of Head Teachers must submit three districts preferences through the e-ShikshaKosh portal. The letter made it clear that the district allotment would be carried out on the principle of merit-

cum-choice; and if a candidate could not be allotted anyone of the districts of their choice based on merit, the nearest available district from their preferences would be assigned on an administrative standpoint. In pursuant to the letter, all the successful candidates, including the petitioners, who were selected as Head Teachers submitted their district preferences through online, as instructed.

6. On 03.04.2025, the Director, Primary Education, issued a further order disclosing that altogher 35,386 Head Teacher candidates were submitted online preferences, out of which 35,333 online requests were verified. Based on these verified preferences, districts were allotted to those 35,333 candidates.

7. Some of the candidates, on being aggrieved with their non-allocation of preferential posting, preferred C.W.J.C. No.16614 of 2025 before this Court challenging the district allotment made pursuant to the orders dated 02.01.2025 and 03.04.2025, contending that the entire exercise lacked statutory basis. The matter was taken up by a Bench of this Court and by an interim order dated 23.04.2025, the learned Single Judge restrained the respondent-State from taking further action on the basis of the orders dated 02.01.2025 and 03.04.2025.

8. Consequently, the afore-noted writ petition came to be disposed off on 15.07.2025 on being found it infructuous.

9. A fresh exercise of allotment was undertaken on 01.07.2025, wherein the Director, Primary Education, issued Memo No.1837, cancelling the earlier district allotment and initiated a fresh exercise. The order recorded that 35,353 verified candidates had submitted district preferences and basing upon the principle of merit-cum-choice, a Committee constituted under Memo No.896 dated 26.03.2025, reviewed these applications and further allotment was undertaken through the District Allocation Software to 35,334 successful candidates.

10. The Head Teachers are aggrieved with the exercise carried out by the respondent authorities vide order dated 01.07.2025 contained in Memo No.1837. Their grievance is confined to the extent that despite securing higher position in the merit list, their preferences were completely ignored and the candidates ranking below them were given districts of their choice, by disregarding the petitioners' options; and conflicting with the merit-cum-choice principle, the district allotment has been carried out arbitrarily, without any uniform policy to the detriment of the petitioners.

11. Similarly, the result of the Head Master was

published vide Notice dated 01.11.2024 by the BPSC with the cut-off marks under different categories. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna issued an order contained in Memo No.2951 dated 09.04.2024, fixing the date of counselling for the post of Head Master and the candidates were directed to be present. Subsequent thereto, vide letter no.350 dated 07.02.2025 issued under the signature of Director, Secondary Education, Government of Bihar, addressed to all the Regional Deputy Director, Education, Bihar, directing them to obtain the option of three divisions/districts from the candidates of Head Master for their posting against Advertisement No.26/2024.

12. The successful candidates, including the petitioners submitted their option of choice of three districts through their login id at e-ShikshaKosh portal. Subsequently, the list of district wise posting was issued under Memo No.1616 dated 30.06.2025 under the signature of Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna. It is the case of the petitioners of second set of writ petitions that despite the district preferences submitted by them, they have not been allowed their district of choice; notwithstanding higher position in the merit list. In the meanwhile, again the Director, Primary Education on the very

next day issued letter no.1617 dated 01.07.2025, by which all the Regional Deputy Director, Education and District Education Officers were requested to direct all the recommended candidates to submit their five options of block in their allotted districts.

13. One of the Head Masters had approached this Court in C.W.J.C. No.11187 of 2025 assailing the impugned order dated 30.06.2025, wherein a Bench of this Court was pleased to pass interim order, directing till the next date fixed, order dated 30.06.2025 issued under Memo No.1616 by the Director, Primary Education, so far as the petitioner is concerned, shall remain stayed.

14. The grievance of the Head Masters is also identical to those of Head Teachers that the respondents have not followed the principle of merit-cum-choice in allotment of the districts and the entire exercise of allocation of district/block suffers from various illegalities causing serious prejudice to the right and entitlement of the petitioners.

15. In the light of the facts, discussed hereinabove, the order dated 01.07.2025 issued by the Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, vide Memo No.1837, whereby a fresh allotment of the district for appointment of Head

Teachers has been made and further the order under Memo No.1616 dated 30.06.2025 as also letter no.1617 dated 01.07.2025, relating to Head Masters were put to challenge before this Court. The petitioners, in sum and substance, sought for a direction upon the respondent authorities to undertake a fresh exercise for allotment of district strictly on the basis of merit-cum-choice principle giving due consideration to the merit position and preferences submitted by the petitioners and other similarly situated candidates.

16. The submissions of the petitioners led by the learned Senior Advocate, Mr. Lalit Kishore and Mr. Abhinav Srivastava, at the Bar that admittedly under the rules governing recruitment and selection process of the Head Teachers/Head Masters, there is no prescription regarding their posting based upon the principle of merit-cum-choice. In absence of any law/rule or policy decision, the entire exercise undertaken by the respondents authorities are wholly without jurisdiction. The aforesaid fact also stands fortified for the reason that when earlier the challenge was made to the order dated 02.01.2025 and 03.04.2025 issued by the Director, Primary Education, whereby preferences were sought for allocation of the district; on being found it without any statutory basis, the Court, *prima*

facie, accepting the contention of the petitioners made a query to the learned Government Advocate as to under which provision of law/rule or policy decision of the Government, the impugned exercise for posting the selected teachers on the basis of their given place of choice is undertaken. The State authorities could not be able to point out any law/rule or the policy decision and thus the concerned respondent-State withdrew both the impugned orders; but, surprisingly, they proceeded afresh and again allocated the district on preferences based on merit-cum-choice in absence of any rules/ regulations and policy decision and, as such, the subsequent action is nothing but the continuation of the earlier one; hence, it is wholly illegal, arbitrary and unsustainable in law.

17. The learned Senior Advocates for the petitioners further contended that if the principle of merit-cum-choice has been adopted, it should be applied across the Board. Out of total eligible candidates, some of them have been allocated the district of their choice based on their preferences and with respect to some of the candidates, district has been allocated by randomization, run through software and, as such, the action of the respondents suffers from vice of manifest arbitrariness and in violation of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

Reinforcing the aforesaid submissions, Mr. Srivastava, learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners has placed reliance upon the decisions rendered by the Apex Court in the case of **Ramana Dayaram Shetty Vs. International Airport Authority of India and Ors.[(1979) 3 SCC 489]**, especially para-10 thereof and submitted that the Apex Court unequivocally observed that every action of the executive Government must be informed by reasons and should be free from arbitrariness. That is the very essence of rule of law and its bare minimum requirement.

18. It is further urged that where the statue provides for a thing to be done in a particular manner, then it has to be done in that manner and no other manner is permissible. To support the settled proposition, reliance has been placed on **Dipak Babaria and Ors. Vs. State of Gujarat and Ors. [(2014) 3 SCC 502]**.

19. Mr. Lalit Kishore, learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners further submitted that surprisingly on 01.07.2025 vide Memo No.1824, the earlier departmental letter no.973 dated 03.04.2025 came to be cancelled and on the same day itself vide Memo No.1837 dated 01.07.2025, without drafting or formulating policy or any application of mind, the Director, Primary Education came out with the afore-noted order and

allocated fresh district through the district allocation software by the Committee earlier constituted under Memo No.896 dated 26.03.2025 itself, which clearly speaks of non-application of mind. If there was no policy decision, what was the basis of allocation of district and who took the decision and how the district allocation software has allocated the district, is unknown to all and unsupported by any statutory rule(s), is the contention of the learned Senior Advocate. The entire exercise of allocation of district, based upon the principle of merit-cum-choice is nothing but a farce. Both the Senior Advocates, lastly contended that there could not be any reservation in posting, which is unknown to the service jurisprudence and thus the entire exercise of allocation of the preferential district based upon the principle of merit-cum-choice is wholly arbitrary, illegal and they have been put to suffer, despite having good position in the merit list.

20. Mr. P.K. Shahi, learned Advocate General, Bihar who led the argument(s) on behalf of the State respondent authorities started with the submission that the Government of Bihar, in the Department of Education, has shown magnanimity by adopting a human approach of assigning districts and schools to their successful Head Teachers/Head Masters considering the

minimum dislocation of the Teachers. The Department thought it prudent to allow posting at the desired place so that Head Teacher/Head Master may be posted nearer to his/her home. It is the admitted position that the petitioners or the successful candidates, who were duly selected and appointed against the post of Head Teachers/Head Masters do not have any right to claim their posting. It is in this premise, the entire exercise were carried out; however, as vacancy in particular districts were fixed and could not have accommodated, requests beyond the sanctioned posts; hence in order to make the scheme workable, method of merit-cum-choice was resorted to. Each and every candidates were asked to furnish three choices and in accordance with the merit and choice, the data was run on software and posting was notified. However, considering the large number of candidates, particularly in reserved category, who were aggrieved by method of posting and their grievance was that despite having placed in meritorious reserved category but being below in the list of unreserved category, they were denied their choice posting. On the other hand, in the same reserved category, those who were below them and could not secure a place as meritorious reserved candidates were given preferential treatment and thus their contention was that the

methodology adopted by the Department was discriminatory. The suffering met to those teachers compelled them to approach before this Court in C.W.J.C. No.6614 of 2025 and resultant stay of the notification of the posting. This led to reconsideration of the entire exercise and on being found the grievance of reserved category candidates to be *bonafide* and genuine, the method adopted in the first tranche indeed resulted in discrimination; detailed deliberation took place and after thorough examination of legal aspect and on consideration of the fallacy, a fresh procedure is delineated.

21. Referring to the statement made in paragraphs-10, 11 and 12 of the counter affidavit, learned Advocate General submitted that at the first stage successful candidates recommended by the BPSC under unreserved category were allotted to the post of their choice. Thereafter, in the second stage, based on the vacancies available in each district, candidates belonging to disabled category and dependents of freedom fighter were allocated districts on the basis of merit-cum-choice principle. Coming to third stage, successful candidates of the reserved category whose results had been declared in the unreserved category as meritorious reserved category candidates but who could not get their first option

under unreserved quota, were placed above the candidates of their original categories, such as, EWS, BC, SC/ST and allocated districts according to their first, second and third preferences. The remaining unreserved category candidates, on fourth stage, who had not secured their first choice district in stage one, were considered; thereafter for allotment on the basis of their second and third choices. Finally, at the last stage, those successful candidates, who could not be allotted district as per their above stages or under the merit-cum-choice principle even after consideration of their three preferences, were allocated district through a randomization process using software.

22. After narrating the entire facts, the learned Advocate General has taken this Court through the chart annexed as Annexure-R2/B to the counter affidavit stating that all the eligible candidates more than 92% have been allocated district in accordance with their choices. Only, 2662 candidates could not be accommodated on the basis of merit-cum-choice principle and in their cases, districts were allocated through a randomization process run on dedicated software. The petitioners before this Court are those, who falling within rest 8%, aggrieved with their allocation of the district based on randomization. However, it is difficult to accommodate each of

the candidate as per their preferences and, in such compelling circumstances, if the selected candidates have any grievance then Department is prepared to abandon such methodology and assigned posting randomly, as the same is within its jurisdiction, which may ultimately result in large scale of displacement and inconvenience to the selected candidates only.

23. Concluding the afore-noted submissions, reliance has been placed on a decision of the learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Kumar Gaurav Singh & Ors. v. The Bihar Staff Selection Commission and Ors. [L.P.A. No.519 of 2023]**, wherein the learned Division Bench considering various decisions of the Apex Court has concluded that the vacancies created by shifting of the MRC candidates to the districts which they opted should be filled up by those reserved candidates, they would unsettle in the optional districts to which they were appointed. The learned Court opined that the principle in **Union of India v. Ramesh Ram, [(2010) 7 SCC 234]** would not apply in the case rather the decision in the case of **Ritesh R. Sah v. Y.L. Yamul (Dr), [(1996) 3 SCC 253]** and **Tripurari Sharan v. Ranjit Kumar Yadav**,**[(2018) 2 SCC 656]** would squarely apply.

24. This Court has bestowed anxious consideration to

the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the respective parties and carefully perused the materials available on record.

25. True it is that transfer and posting of an employee is the prerogative of the State Government and no right is conferred on an employee to claim a particular place of posting. Even if the State Government calls for option for place of posting, it is not bound to accept the same. The transfer and posting being an incident and exigencies of service; a government servant has no vested right to remain posted at his/her choice. Hence, no legal right being conferred on the Government employee to seek a writ of mandamus unless it is actuated with malice and *de hors* the rules, regulations or the policy decision of the State.

26. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Bihar v. Kaushal Kishore Singh & Ors.[1991(1) PLJR 5(SC)]**, has observed that "*even if options were called for and given, it is not mandatory for the Government to accept options of the candidates and make appointment to the post. Asking for option of candidate is only a discretionary matter and the Government is not bound to select the candidates on the basis thereof. Under these circumstances, the candidates who applied*

for, though opted for, have no acquired rights, much less indefeasible and absolute right for selection or appointment to a particular post. As stated earlier, the Government have to prescribe an objective and rational method or manner of allotment of the candidates selected to the departments, depending upon their job necessity and requirement."

27. It would also be pertinent to observe that every policy of the State, like any rule may not be totally mandatory. But the decision to allocate the district based upon preferences on the basis of principle of merit-cum-choice create somewhat a right in the person, who is more meritorious. In such a situation, even if the policy has not been framed but a decision is taken by the Government, thus, it obliges the Government to adhere to it unless there is good reasons for acting at variance with the only caution, that every action of the State has to be just and fair. To say the least, any order which is arbitrary, is in breach of Article 14 of the Constitution of Indian and vulnerable to challenge.

28. Undisputedly, there is no prescription available under the rules, which govern the recruitment/selection process of the Head Teachers and Head Masters, for inviting options from the successful candidates to allocate them their preferential district nor the State authorities produced any executive

instruction or policy decision empowering the respondent-State authorities to allocate preferential district based upon their preference options at the time of posting of the respective Head Teachers/Head Masters. Nonetheless, the State has shown his magnanimity and taken a human approach of assigning preferential district to the successful Head Teachers/Head Masters where they desired their posting for the reasons of minimum dislocation of such teachers so that they can efficiently discharge their duties and impart education to the children.

29. Now, the question for consideration before this Court is "as to whether in absence of the statutory rules, regulations or policy decision, whether the State is empowered to take such a decision of extending posting of the Head Teachers/Head Masters based upon their preferential option of the district/block on the principle of merit-cum-choice."

30. **V. R. Krishna Iyer, J.** in the case of **Som Prakash Rekhi Vs. The Union of India & Anr., [1981 (1) SCC 449]**, has observed that "social justice is the conscience of our Constitution, the State is the promoter of economic justice, the founding faith which sustains the Constitution and the country is Indian humanity. The State as a model employer is

expected to show fairness in action."

31. In **Balram Gupta v. Union of India and Another**, **[AIR 1987 SC 2354]**, the Apex Court has observed that as a model employer the Government must conduct itself with high probity and candour with its employees.

32. While laying emphasis on the role of State as a 'model employer' the Apex Court in **Bhupendra Nath Hazarika and Another vs. State of Assam and Others**, **[2013 (2) SCC 516]** has observed in para-65, as follows:-

> "65. We have stated the role of the State as a model employer with the fond hope that in future a deliberate disregard is not taken recourse to and deviancy of such magnitude is not adopted to frustrate the claims of the employees. It should always be borne in mind that legitimate aspirations of the employees are not guillotined and a situation is not created where hopes end in despair. Hope for everyone is gloriously precious and a model employer should not convert it to be deceitful and treacherous by playing a game of chess with their seniority. A sense of calm sensibility and concerned sincerity should be reflected in every step. An atmosphere of trust has to prevail and when the employees are absolutely sure that their trust shall not be betrayed and they shall be treated with dignified fairness then only the concept of good governance can be concretized. We say no

more.”

33. It would be worth noting here that welfare State denotes a concept of Government wherein the State not only plays a key role in the protection and promotion of economic and social well-being of its citizens, but it also refers to greatest of good for the greatest number and the benefit of all and the happiness of all.

34. In **State of Haryana & Ors. v. Piara Singh & Ors.**, **[1992 (4) SCC 118]**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has ruled that the main concern of the court in such matters is to ensure the rule of law and to see that the State and Executive act fairly and give a fair deal to its employees consistent with the requirements of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

35. After careful reading of the afore-noted rulings, this Court is of the opinion that the State being the model employer is obliged to take a decision in the greatest of good for the greatest number and the benefit of all. However, this exercise must be in consonance with the Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

36. Time without number the Court has opined that in absence of any statutory rules, regulations or policy decision, the State Government may take a decision which would fill up the gap and supplement it but not supplant, contrary to the prescriptions of

the statute.

37. The very thrust of the argument(s) of the learned Advocate General, representing the State of Bihar, does attract to the Court, as the decision to allocate preferential district based upon preferential option on the principle of merit-cum-choice was adopted by the Education Department as a humane approach showing magnanimity for the benefit of greatest number of the Teachers, as it has been informed to this Court and apprised through a chart that out of the total eligible candidates, more than 92% have been allocated their choice posting; only 2662 candidates could not be accommodated on the basis of their merit and choice; besides none of the petitioners able to show that any junior in the panel to him/her in the category has been extended preference over his/her claim. Thus, the action of the respondent-State to the extent of extending preferential allocation of the district/block cannot be said to be unjust, arbitrary and in violation of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

38. The petitioners before this Court are admittedly those, who fall within 8% i.e. 2662 and a lesser number of candidates, who could not be accommodated on the basis of their merit and choice because of absence of the vacancies in

their preferential district(s). The stand of the petitioners, disclosing arbitrariness and the prejudice caused to them, through a chart, duly prepared and placed vide para-27 of C.W.J.C. No.16462 of 2025, was duly explained and answered through a comparative chart, brought on record as Annexure-R2/B of the counter affidavit, making a comparison of the petitioners with the candidates of different categories. The comparison of the petitioners are mainly with the candidates, who belonged to different reserved categories and, as such, their comparison and the submission of arbitrariness has no leg to stand.

39. Any dispute raised by the petitioners or comparison can be relevant *inter se* between the unreserved category candidates. The general category candidates have nothing to do with that of the reserved category candidates. Their comparison could be made only within their category and not otherwise. The meritorious reserved category, who have acquired position below in the list of unreserved category and thereupon denied their choice posting despite having secured good position in the reserved category but only for the reason having secured position in the list of unreserved category, they could not be denied preferential treatment, as it would be a bane

for them to having secured position in both unreserved category as well as reserved category.

40. In the case of **Ritesh R. Sah** (supra), the Apex Court while dealing with a question that a meritorious reserved candidate is placed in the reserved merit list of his category, he would be ranking high and may get better choice of institution or course in a medical institution and in contrary if the same is not provided, the meritorious reserved candidate could be placed in a disadvantageous position, if he would not be treated as reserved candidate, held that it would amount to making him suffer for his better performance in the competitive examination. The Apex Court in para-17 of the afore-noted judgment has observed, as follows:-

> "17. … In view of the legal position enunciated by this Court in the aforesaid cases the conclusion is irresistible that a student who is entitled to be admitted on the basis of merit though belonging to a reserved category cannot be considered to be admitted against seats reserved for reserved category. But at the same time the provisions should be so made that it will not work out to the disadvantage of such candidate and he may not be placed at a more disadvantageous position than the other less meritorious reserved category candidates. The aforesaid objective can

> be achieved if after finding out the candidates from amongst the reserved category who would otherwise come in the open merit list and then asking their option for admission into the different colleges which have been kept reserved for reserved category and thereafter the cases of less meritorious reserved category candidates should be considered and they be allotted seats in whichever colleges the seats should be available. In other words, while a reserved category candidate entitled to admission on the basis of his merit will have the option of taking admission in the colleges where a specified number of seats have been kept reserved for reserved category but while computing the percentage of reservation he will be deemed to have been admitted as an open category candidate and not as a reserved category candidate."

41. Reinforcing the afore-noted proposition, the Apex Court in the case of **Tripurari Sharan** (supra), has further held in para-8, as under:-

> "8. Often, in a competitive examination held for the purpose of admission in technical and medical institutions etc. some candidates belonging to reserved category/categories, qualify for the higher ranking on the basis of their own merit and depending on their performance in the common entrance test, are placed in the general

> merit list. Such class of candidates belonging to reserved categories who qualify on their own merit, to be placed in general merit list, are described, for the purpose of convenience, as Meritorious Reserved Candidate (MRC). It is by now well settled that a MRC who goes on to occupy a general category seat is not counted against the quota reserved for a reserved category candidates, but is treated as an open competition candidate or general merit candidate."

42. The principle reiterated and reaffirmed by the Apex Court clearly crystallized that even when an MRC opts for a seat reserved for reserved category candidates, caution has to be exercised to maintain the reservation to 50%. So also it is not open for the authorities to deny a MRC a seat in the college of his preference based on his merit, if such seat is available at the relevant point of time and the same is reserved for candidates of the reserved category to which the MRC belongs. This is because there may be instances where a MRC may not get a seat in the institution of his choice on the basis of his own merit in the general merit list. Under such circumstances, he may opt to be treated notionally as a candidate belonging to the reserved category only for the purpose of getting a seat in the college reserved for reserved category students.

43. The case in hand deals with the Head Teachers and Head Masters in different primary, elementary as well as secondary and higher secondary schools, in the different districts of the State of Bihar forms only one cadre, respectively. Advertisements No.25/2024 and 26/2024 clearly extended the benefit of reservation to the candidate of reserved category for the purpose of their selection and appointment; hence, consideration of their performance and position in their respective cadre cannot be ignored and placed them in disadvantageous position by not permitting him to be treated as reserved candidate(s) even for the allocation of preferential district, the exercise of which is undertaken on the principle of merit-cum-choice.

44. This Court also finds substance on the reliance placed by the learned Advocate General in **Kumar Gaurav Singh** (supra), wherein the learned Division Bench of this Court considering all the afore-noted decisions, besides the decision of **Ramesh Ram** (supra), a Constitution Bench decision followed by **Alok Kumar Pandit v. State of Assam, [(2012) 13 SCC 516]**, with respect to appointment to civil services, has finally concluded in paragraphs-25 and 26, as follows:-

> “25. The merit list was prepared and a list of candidates entitled to be accommodated in the

reservation post was also prepared, and then the options were considered. A person having higher merit would be considered for his or her optional district first and it is in that context that ‘the MRC’ candidates who would be appointed as an Agricultural Coordinator on merit would be shifted to his optional district in a reserved vacancy, which does not give him any additional benefit or a perceived higher status in the service of the State. It is more a rule of convenience so as to enable the meritorious candidate to get a district of his/her option, than one resulting in divergence of status, when a meritorious candidate is allotted to a higher service having a different status based on the option exercised. If, in the event of identity of status in the service to which appointment is made, the reserved vacancy is deemed to have been filled up by a MRC candidate allotted to a district of his choice, then it would be effacing the merit of ‘the MRC’ candidate belonging to the reserved category. Hence, when a notional adjustment is made on the basis of the option exercised insofar as the district to which the appointment is to be made, the shifting of the appointment is only as against ‘the MRC’ candidate and the reserved category candidate having a lesser merit, in which circumstance, the reserved candidate having a lesser merit will have to be considered to the vacancy created by the shifting made of ‘the MRC’ candidate. On the

above reasoning, in the facts and circumstances of the instant case, we are of the opinion that the principle in **Ramesh Ram** (supra) would not apply and that in **Ritesh R.Sah** and **Tripurari Sharan** (both supra) would squarely apply.

26. We hold that the 93 vacancies created by shifting of 'the MRC' candidates to the districts which they opted should be filled up by those reserved candidates, they would unsettle in the optional districts to which they were appointed. Though reference was made to Annexure-7, the initial opinion of the General Administration Department and the opinion of the Advocate General, we are of the view that this does not regulate the adjudication of the issue agitated herein, which is also governed by decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Our interpretation would prevail over that of the department and the Learned Advocate General."

45. Since in the case in hand, the State has adopted the policy of merit-cum-choice in case of initial posting of Head Teachers/Head Masters, which decision of the State is directly linked with their merit(s), the choice of place of posting depending upon the merit(s) has to be adhered to. A candidate higher in merit has a legal right to be given the choice place of posting in preference to person lower in merit and the State has to bear corresponding legal obligation and, in such situation, the

right can be enforced by invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

46. The position is admitted to the extent that out of 35334 Head Teachers, 32,672 were allocated districts as per their choice and only 2662 successful candidates were allocated districts through randomization, which gave rise to the litigation as they have not been assigned preferential posting on the basis of their merit(s). Similar is the case of Head Masters. The policy adopted by the State was only with a view to minimize far dislocation of Head Teachers/Head Masters. The difficulties of the State to accommodate each of the candidates in their preferential district would not be possible in case of non-availability of vacancy in their preferential district and thus the respondent authorities cannot be compelled to give preferential treatment to all those, who have secured their position in their respective category below the persons, who have been given preferential allocation based upon the merit-cum-choice principle. Hence, no interference is required to the impugned orders, challenged in the bunch of these writ petitions.

47. However, this Court finds that allocation of the district(s) by randomization through software to rest of the candidates is not fair, as because of such process, they have

been displaced to far flung areas since there was no remaining option available. Comprehending such adverse situation to those, who have been displaced to far flung district/area, this Court thinks it apt and proper to direct the Committee which has been assigned the work of allocation of the preferential district to invite their objections and deal with them manually after acknowledging their home district and their reason for posting in nearby district(s) qua the vacancy in the respective districts/blocks with their merit position.

48. The learned Advocate General, during the course of argument(s), on the observation made by this Court, afore-noted, has submitted that the State has no difficulty to contemplate such exercise in the best interest of the remaining candidates, who because of non-availability of the vacancy in the district(s) could not get preferential allocation/posting.

49. In view of the aforesaid, this Court directs the Additional Chief Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna to convene a meeting with the Director, Secondary Education as well as the Director, Primary Education to frame a model for redressal of grievance of allocation of nearby district after inviting objection, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a

copy of this order.

50. Before parting with the decision, it is also made clear that the respondent-State shall not take any adverse action against any of the Head Teachers/Head Masters, who have not submitted their joining because of pendency of the writ petitions in their respective schools.

51. The writ petitions stand disposed off with the aforesaid observation(s) and direction(s).

52. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	21-08-2025
Uploading Date	30-08-2025
Transmission Date	