



HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA

_A_G_A_R_T_A_L_A_

W.A.No.30 of 2026

1. Bijoy Kanti Ghosh, S/O- Lt. Rakhal Ghosh, Superintendent of Fisheries, Mohanpur, West Tripura-799211
2. Sri Tikendrajit Jamatia, S/O- Lt. Chitta Ranjan Jamatia, Deputy Director of Fisheries, Ambassa, Dhalai-799289

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

1. The State of Tripura, represented by the Secretary, Department of Fisheries, Government of Tripura, N.C.C., Agartala, West Tripura-799010
2. The Director of Fisheries, Government of Tripura, P.N. Complex, Gurkhabasti, Agartala, West Tripura-799006

.....Respondent(s)

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Sudipta Sekhar Debnath, Advocate. Mr. Debarun Singh Kunwar, Advocate.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Karnajit De, Addl. G.A.

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT

=O=R=D=E=R=

06/05/2026

Heard counsel for the appellants and Addl. G.A. for the respondents.

2. The appellants have challenged in this Writ Appeal the judgment dt. 22.09.2025 in WP(C)No.182 of 2025 of the Learned Single Judge dismissing the said Writ Petition on the ground of laches and delay.

3. Though the appellants were appointed temporarily on ad-hoc basis as Fishery Officers on 11.03.1997, later, on 25.11.1998 by another Office order issued by the Director of Fisheries they were appointed to the same post on regular basis in the prescribed pay scale with other relevance. They claimed in the Writ Petition that their services should be treated as regular from the date of their initial appointment on ad-hoc basis.



4. Having been unsuccessful in making a representation for the first time on 19.11.2018 to 2nd respondent, on the basis of the judgment of this Court dt. 10.08.2015 in W.A.No.67 of 2014, the appellants had approached this Court by the said Writ Petition.

5. The Learned Single Judge, however, held that the Office order dt. 25.11.1998 did not make any specific mention that the effect of regularization of their services was from 25.11.1998 and so cause of action had accrued upon the appellants on that date. He held that it is not a case of continuing wrong or continuous cause of action and that they had approached the Court after 25 years therefrom.

6. Though counsel for the appellants sought to contend that the cause of action is deemed to have accrued only from the date of knowledge of the judgment in W.A.No.67 of 2014, we may point out that the basis for the claim of the petitioner is the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Direct Recruit Class II Engineering Officers' Association Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others**¹. The Law had been settled by the said judgment in 1990 itself and so the claim made in 2018 by the appellants is hopelessly belated and the Learned Single Judge, therefore, had rightly dismissed the Writ Petition and denied the relief claimed by them.

7. Therefore, we find no error in the judgment of the Learned Single Judge warranting interference in the Writ Appeal.

Accordingly, the appeal fails and dismissed.

(BISWAJIT PALIT, J)

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, CJ)

¹ (1990) 2 SCC 715



SABYASACHI
BHATTACHARJEE
JEE
Sabyasachi B

Digitally signed by
SABYASACHI
BHATTACHARJEE
Date: 2026.05.08
17:02:26 +05'30'

HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA



सत्यमेव जयते