

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (S) No. 485 of 2017

Md. Muzzaffar Ansari

... **Petitioner**

Versus

State of Jharkhand & Ors.

... **Respondents**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUJIT NARAYAN PRASAD

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Rahul Saboo, G.P.-II
	: Mr. Gaurang Jajodia, A.C. to G.P.-II
For the J.A.C.	: Mrs. Richa Sanchita, Advocate
	: Ms. Risheeta Singh, Advocate

27/Dated: 6th May, 2026

1. It is a case where the prayer has been made for quashing the appointment of respondent No. 8 on the ground that the basis on which he was appointed on the post of Alim by the decision of the Madarsa Management Committee in which the Pradhan Maulvi, the respondent no. 7 was one of the members.
2. This Court, while hearing the matter, has called upon the state authority, as also the Jharkhand Academic Council to file their affidavits.
3. Simultaneous thereto, the notice has also been issued upon the respondent No. 8.
4. It appears from the office notes that even the notice has been served upon respondent No. 8, but he had chosen not to appear.
5. The nature of allegation is serious, and as such, the District Education Officer, Godda has conducted the inquiry twice to corroborate the allegation which has been made by the writ

petitioner in the process of selection of the respondent No. 8, the said two Inquiry reports dated 31.08.2015 (Annexure-C) & 10.09.2016 (Annexure-G) have been annexed.

6. The inquiry report suggests that the fact of relationship between the respondent No. 7 and 8 has been admitted, but at the time of conducting inquiry, it was prime accountability of the District Education Officer Godda to also verify from the record for the purpose of going through the constitution of the member of the interview board, so as to come to the conclusion regarding the correctness of the allegation, which is the subject matter of the present writ petition, but reason best known to the District Education Officer Godda that he has not come with the specific finding to that effect.
7. This Court, therefore, considered the aforesaid conduct of the District Education Officer, Godda to be erroneous and appears to help the Managing Committee.
8. This Court, in view of the aforesaid, is hereby directing the Deputy Commissioner, Godda to conduct an inquiry afresh and submit a report thereof on or before the next date of hearing. The report must appended with the relevant documents available on record to be made part of the affidavit.
9. The further necessary order with respect to the conduct of District Education Officer Godda will be considered on the next date of hearing.

10. In the meanwhile, let notice be issued upon the respondent No. 7 under both Ordinary Process and Speed Post, for which, requisites etc, must be filed within a week.

11. The notice is made returnable on 17th June, 2026.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

6th May, 2026
Samarth