

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.221 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 7948 of 2007

Dayanand Kumar S/o Sri Bijendra Prasad Yadav Resident of Village Patarghatti, P.O. + Block + P.S. Triveniganj, District Supaul.

..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary Department of Education, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Regional Deputy Director of Education Koshi Division, Saharsa.
4. The District Magistrate, Supaul.
5. The District Superintendent of Education, District Supaul.
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Supaul, District Supaul.
7. The Director District Rural Development Authority, Supaul.
8. The Sub Divisional Officer, Triveniganj, District Supaul.
9. The Block Development Officer, Triveniganj, District Supaul.
10. Navindra Thakur, the Secretary of Panchayat, Gram Panchayat Thalha Gadhiya, South, Anchal Triveniganj, District Supaul.
11. The Popularly Elected Mukhiya of Gram Panchayat Thalha Gadhiya, South Anchal Triveniganj, District Supaul.
12. The High School Teacher Member of Teacher Selection Committee, Gram Panchayat Thalha Gadhiya, Anchal Triveniganj, District Supaul.
13. The Panchayat Samiti Member, gram Panchayat, Thalaha Gadhiya South, Anchal Triveniganj, District Supaul.
14. Ward Member, Member of Teacher Selection Committee, Gram Panchayat Thalha Gadhiya, Anchal Triveniganj, District Supaul.
15. Rajesh Kumar Gupta S/o Kunni Sah Resident of Village Patarghatti, P.O. + P.S. Block Triveniganj, District Supaul.

.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ajeet Pratap Singh (Sc15)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ADITYA KUMAR TRIVEDI
ORAL ORDER

2 05-01-2016

Petitioner's case along with other allied cases were

taken up and was disposed of analogously vide order dated 13.07.2011 wherein petitioner was given an opportunity to approach the concerned District Teacher Appellate Authority within a period of six weeks from the date of pronouncement of the order that means to say six weeks within the date of order

dated 13.07.2011.

Though the petitioner under para-5 of his petition had tried to explain that on account of mistake on the part of counsel for the petitioner, where under he has not been given information, cannot be accepted in the background of the fact that he remained silent for the last four years and in 2015 filed the instant petition for extension of the time, which, if allowed will frustrate the spirit of the order side by side will also adversely affect the others regarding whom, there happens to be direction to the appellate authority to notice and hear.

Considering the conduct of the petitioner, the instant petition is found as devoid of merit and accordingly dismissed.

amit

(Aditya Kumar Trivedi, J)

U			
---	--	--	--