

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.611 of 2014

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12284 of 2007

=====

Shashi Ranjan Kumar, son of Sri Yadolal Prasad, resident of village-
Belthawa, P.S. Pipra Kothi, District- East Champaran (Sadar Motihari)

.... Appellant

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs,
New Delhi

2. The Assistant Director (FB-1), FHQ, SSB, New Delhi- 66.

3. The Assistant Director (Vigilance) PHQ, SSB, New Delhi

4. The Staff Officer (Admn), Frontier Hqr, SSB, Arpan, New Baily
Road, Danapur, Patna

5. The Accounts/QM Branch/Insp/HQ/M.I. Room/SRC, New Delhi

6. The Inspectors (H.Qrs.), S.S.B., New Delhi- 66.

7. The CRC Cell, 29th Bn. SSB Khaprail, P.O. Matigara, District-
Darjeeling (W.B.)

8. The F.O. (Clerk/SRC 29th Battalian Khaprail, P.O. New Chunta,
District- Darjeeling (W.B.)

9. The Commandant, 29th Battalian, SSB Khaprail, District- Darjeeling
(W.B.)

10. The Deputy Commandant, Office of the Commandant, 29th
Battalian SSB, Khaprail, District- Darjeeling (W.B.)

11. The District Superintendent of Education, East Champaran

12. The State of Bihar

13. The Headmaster, Rajkiya Madhya Vidyalaya, Khiri, Mushar Toli,
Chakia, East Champaran (Motihari)

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Raghwanand, Advocate
For the Union of India : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Pandey, SCGC
Mr. Ravinder Kumar Sharma, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH
And
HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)
Date: 05-01-2016

There is delay of 230 days in filing the appeal and no cogent reason has been given for the same. No sufficient ground for condonation of delay has been made. Interlocutory Application being I.A. No. 3057/2014 for condoning the delay is hereby rejected.

Learned counsel for the appellant then invited our attention to the merits in the matter. We have perused the records and learned Single Judge has taken into account the true fact relating to the appointment of the appellant. The learned Single Judge has noted that the appellant's appointment letter itself specifically mentioned that the services should be terminated with one month notice and payment. In that regard, the appellant does not dispute that he did receive one month notice and pay, and accordingly, it was not a punishment nor any stigma is attached to him. He has been dismissed as per contract of the appointment itself.

Thus, we find no merit in this appeal as well.

This appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.)

(Nilu Agrawal, J.)

Rajeev/N.A.F.R.

U			
---	--	--	--