

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

W.P.(C) No.43 of 2015

Sri Bimal Bhaumik,
son of late Birendra Ch. Bhaumik,
resident of Dhaleswar Road No.9,
Agartala, P.S. East Agartala,
District – West Tripura.

..... **Petitioner**

- V e r s u s -

- 1. The State of Tripura,**
represented by the Secretary,
Government of Tripura, Home
Affairs, Agartala, Tripura West.
- 2. The Secretary,**
Government of Tripura, Home
Affairs, Agartala, Tripura West,
PIN-799006.
- 3. Tripura Police Accountability Commission,**
Shyamali Bazar, Agartala, P.O.
Kunjaban, P.S. East Agartala,
District – Tripura West,
represented by the Secretary,
T.P.A.C., Shyamali Bazar,
Agartala, West Tripura.
- 4. The Secretary,**
Tripura Police Accountability
Commission, Govt. of Tripura,
Shyamali Bazar, Agartala, P.O.
Kunjaban, P.S. East Agartala,
District – Tripura West.

..... **Respondents**

**BEFORE
THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. DEEPAK GUPTA
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. TALAPATRA**

For the petitioner : Mr. D.R. Choudhury, Advocate
Mr. D. Deb, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. T.D. Majumder, G.A.

Date of hearing and delivery : **24.02.2015**
of judgment and order

Whether it is fit for reporting :

Yes	No
	✓

JUDGMENT & ORDER (ORAL)

(Deepak Gupta, CJ)

The petitioner by means of this petition has challenged the order dated 18th September, 2012, whereby the prayer of the petitioner made vide his representation dated 31.08.2012 has been rejected.

[2] We are not going into the merits of the case because the petitioner in his writ petition has not made a single averment as to why he could not approach this Court for more than 3(three) years. The impugned order was passed on 18th September, 2012 and this writ petition has been filed on 3rd February, 2015 three years and four and a half months after the date of passing of the impugned order. The prayer is only for grant of monetary relief.

[3] The petitioner is the retired officer of the Indian Administrative Service. His disputes relates to the period when he was a member of the Police Accountability Commission. Therefore, we can assume that he is well versed with law and knows what his rights are. He is not an illiterate rustic villager. Therefore, the petition is dismissed as being barred by the principles of delay and latches without expressing any opinion on merits.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sujay