

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 15685 of 2007

=====

Triloki Nath Srivastava, son of Late Nanhku Prasad, resident of Mohalla-
Brahmpur, P.S. – Phulwari, District – Patna (Bihar), PIN No. 801505.

.... PETITIONER

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Personal and Administrative Reforms
Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna.

.... RESPONDENTS

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Tiwary

For the Respondent/s : AC to Addl. Advocate General - 6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4. 30-06-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.C. to Addl. Advocate General – 6.

The petitioner, invoking writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, has prayed for quashing of **Annexure ‘3’** to the writ petition i.e. Memo No. 8961 dated 31-08-2007, whereby, the representation filed by the petitioner was rejected on the ground that it was stale since the matter was related to an event, which had taken place 25-27 years ago.

Learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that earlier in respect of 27th Combined Examination, held by the B.P.S.C. in the year 1979, the petitioner had approached this Court by filing a writ petition, vide C.W.J.C. No. 4207 of 1981 complaining therein

that ignoring the case of the petitioner, some persons, who had secured lesser marks than the petitioner, were recommended. This Court with certain observations disposed of the writ petition. It was observed that the authority concerned will take decision in the matter within three months from the date of order.

Ofcourse, the order of this Court was passed on 13th September, 1982, the petitioner after lapse of several years i.e. in the year 2007 approached the authority concerned regarding his claim, which has simply been rejected, vide **Annexure '3'** to the writ petition.

The Court is of the opinion that once in the matter, writ jurisdiction was invoked and certain directions were issued, in any event, almost on similar relief, the petitioner may not be allowed to invoke the writ jurisdiction again. Moreover, the claim of the petitioner pertains to an examination conducted by the B.P.S.C., which was held in 1979 and as such, I do not find any ground to pass any positive order in the matter.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay/-

U			
---	--	--	--