

GAHC010009002015



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/901/2015

MD. ZAKIR HUSSAIN
S/O RAFIKUDDIN AHMED, VILL. KANIKUCHI, P.O. KANIHA, P.S. RANGIA,
DIST- KAMRUP, ASSAM

VERSUS

THE ASSAM STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD and 8 ORS
THROUGH ITS CHAIRMAN, BIJULEE BHAVAN, PALTAN BAZAR, GHY-8

2:THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER HR
APDCL
BIJULEE BHAVAN
PALTAN BAZAR
GHY-8

3:THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER D
APDCL
BIJULEE BHAVAN
PALTAN BAZAR
GHY-8

4:THE DY. PERSONNEL MANAGER
O/O THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER D
APDCL LAR
BIJULEE BHAVAN
PALTAN BAZAR
GHY-8

5:THE GENERAL MANAGER
GUWAHATI ZONE
APDCL LAR
DWARANDHA

SIX MILE
GHY-22

6:THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
RANGIA ELECTRICAL CIRCLE
APDCL LAR
RANGIA
DIST- KAMRUP

7:THE DY. GENERAL MANAGER
RANGIA ELECTRICAL CIRCLE
APDCL LAR
RANGIA
DIST- KAMRUP

8:THE SECY.
PERSONNEL B DEPTT. GOVT. OF ASSAM
DISPUR
GHY-6

9:THE SECY.
POWER E DEPTT.
GOVT. OF ASSAM
DISPUR
GHY-

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR.S ALI, MR.S SHARMA,MR.N N UPADHAYA,MR.P K
BORDOLOI

Advocate for the Respondent : , SC, POWER GRID(R9),SC, PERSONNEL DEPT.(R8),SC, A S E
B(R1-7)

**BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUMAN SHYAM**

ORDER

22.10.2024

None appears for the writ petitioner when the matter is called up.

Ms. M. Bhattacharjee, learned Additional Senior Government Advocate, Assam
is present on behalf of respondent Nos.8 and 9 whereas, Mr. W. Ahmed, learned
counsel representing Mr. B. Choudhury, learned Standing Counsel, APDCL, is

present on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 7.

By filing this writ petition the petitioner has prayed for a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint him as "Sahayak" pursuant to the process initiated vide advertisement notice issued in the year 2013. The prayer of the petitioner appears to be based on another judgment of this Court passed in WP(C) No.125/2010 which was upheld in Writ Appeal No.302/2010.

Be that as it may, the petitioner has not appeared to argue the matter today and on the previous occasion also, his counsel have pleaded lack of instruction and therefore, had failed to advance any argument in the matter.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that no live issue survives in this writ petition for adjudication. That apart, the petitioner also does not appear to be keen in pursuing the writ petition. As such, the writ petition stand dismissed for non-prosecution.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant