

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No.2527 of 2022

Bhuneshwar Ram, son of Ramawatar Bhuiyan, resident of Village
 Ulgada, P.O. & P.S. Panki, District Palamu. **... .. Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. The State of Jharkhand, through the Secretary, Social Welfare,
 Women and Child Development Department, Government of
 Jharkhand, Project Building, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, District
 Ranchi.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Palamu, P.O. & P.S. Palamu, District
 Palamu.
4. Block Education Extension Officer-cum-Block Resource Centre
 Coordinator, Panki, Palamu, P.O. + P.S. Panki, District Palamu.
5. The District Superintendent of Education, Palamu, P.O., P.S. &
 District Palamu.
6. Sub Divisional Education Officer, Palamu, P.O., P.S. & District
 Palamu.
7. Block Education Officer, Palamu, P.O., P.S. & District Palamu.

... .. Respondents

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) :	Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent(s):	Mr. Vishal Kr. Rai, AC to GA-IV
	Mr. Krishna Murari, Advocate

09/ 21.01.2026

By filing this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for
 the following reliefs:-

- (i) *For issuance of an appropriate writ, order or
 direction for quashing the letter bearing memo
 no. 266 dated 14.12.2021 (Annexure-2)
 issued by the Block Education Extension
 Officer-cum-Block Resource Centre
 Coordinator, Panki, Palamu whereby and
 where under the Respondent No.4 has been
 pleased to terminate the petitioner from the
 post of Para teacher with immediate effect and
 also direct the petitioner to handover the
 charge of the Para Teacher to Sri Amresh*

Kumar and further direct the petitioner to send compliance report to his office.

AND

(ii) The petitioner prays for a further direction upon the respondents to pay salary to the petitioner since June, 2017 which has not been paid without assigning any reason."

2. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioner and learned counsel representing the respondents.

3. The petitioner has challenged the Office Order as contained in Memo No.266, Panki, dated 14.12.2021 (Annexure-2 to the writ petition), which according to the petitioner is his termination order.

4. Mr. Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that once the petitioner had handed over the charge of the said School to Shri Amaresh Prasad Yadav, the petitioner was not being allowed to join, thus, his service has been terminated by the respondents.

5. Mr. Krishna Murari, learned counsel representing the respondent – the District Superintendent of Education-cum-UDPO, on instruction submits that the aforesaid Office Order is not an order of termination. He submits that by the said Office Order, the petitioner was directed to handover the charge of the In-Charge of the School to Shri Amaresh Prasad Yadav. He also submits that thereafter the petitioner is not coming to the School.

6. Considering the submission of Mr. Krishna Murari, as per the instruction received by him from his client, I direct the petitioner

to report to the District Superintendent of Education, Palamu, who will assign further work to him.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner will be paid his salary for the period which he has actually worked.

8. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this writ petition stands **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

*21st January, 2026
Prashant. Cp-2*

Uploaded on 27.01.2026