



2026:PATHC:14788

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2167 of 2026

Shubhankar Kumar son of Krishna Mohan Ray, resident of Village- Gangora Tola, Ward no.04, P.O.- Bihra,, P.S. Bihra District- Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Chief Secretary Govt. of Bihar, Patna - 800015.
2. The Addl. Chief Secretary, Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Chairman Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.
5. The Examination Controller (Misc.) Bihar School Examination Board, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Raja Ram Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. AC to AG
For the BSEB	:	Mr. P.K. Shahi, Sr. Adv.
		Mr. Gyan Prakash, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 10-02-2026

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has invoked the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court for the following reliefs:-

“(i) To quash the instruction for Examination of STET (in short Secondary Teacher Eligibility Test) 2024 issued under Advertise no.442/2023 dated 13-12-2023 as the reservation policy of the Government has been implemented for qualifying marks in the Teachers Eligibility Test not permitted under law.

(ii) To issue direction upon the Respondents to issue Fresh instructions and Guidelines for STET





without implication of Reservation policy in qualifying marks as the test is for profession of teaching and the test is not a competitive examination.

(iii) To issue a writ of Mandamus declaring all the activity under the instruction contained in Advertisement no.442/2023 unconstitutional and illegal.

(iv) To issue other proper writ/order/direction/orders to the ends of justice.”

3. The learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that the Government of Bihar is not implementing the reservation policy in the correct perspective, thereby causing serious prejudice to the rights and entitlements of the petitioner.

4. The learned Advocate for the State and the Bihar School Examination Board submitted that the implementation of the reservation policy falls within the domain of the State Government, and the present writ petition appears to be misconceived.

5. At this stage, the learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that, for redressal of his grievance, the petitioner has already approached before the authorities concerned, but they have not taken any decision.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced and





taking note of the nature of the grievance, this Court does not find any reason or occasion to entertain the present petition at this stage. Liberty is, however, reserved to the petitioner to file a detailed representation before respondent no.2, preferably within a period of two weeks from today.

7. In case such a representation is filed, the same shall be looked into by the concerned respondent, who shall pass a reasoned and speaking order considering the grievance of the petitioner, within a further period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the representation.

8. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

