

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9685 of 2014

- =====
1. Kumari Manuja Kumari Singh @ Kumari Manuja Singh Daughter of Late Muneshwar Pd. Singh, Wife of Shri Ajay Kumar Singh Resident of Mahanth Nagar, Barmasia, P.S & Distt- Katihar.
 2. Bindu Kumari D/o Shri Shiv Nandan Sah, Wife of Shri Birendra Kumar Sah Resident of Aryan Shopping Gerawari Road, Mirchaibari, P.S & Distt- Katihar.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary Human Resources Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Commissioner, Purnea Division, Purnea.
3. The Director Primary Education Govt. of Bihar New Secretariat, Patna.
4. The District Teacher Appointment Appellate Tribunal Katihar, Distt. Katihar.
5. The District Superintendent of Education, Katihar, Distt- Katihar.
6. The Block Education Officer, Mansahi, P.S Mansahi, Distt- Katihar.
7. The Secretary Gram Panchayat Phulhara, Mansahi, Distt- Katihar.
8. The Mukhia Gram Panchayat Phulhara, Mansahi, Distt- Katihar.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh, AAG13
Mrs. Sunita Kumari, AC to AAG13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
ORAL ORDER

2 24-10-2016 Grievance raised by the petitioners with regard to their non-selection for appointment on the post of Panchayat Teacher in response to the vacancy of the year 2006 was sought to be agitated by these petitioners by moving the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority in the year 2013. The Tribunal after considering the allegations as well as factual position has in categorical terms held that the exercise was completed as far back as on 20th of March, 2008 and the present dispute has been raised

by these petitioners after much delay and as an afterthought.

The Court is in agreement with the rationale and reasoning provided by the District Teachers Employment Appellate Authority in its order dated 1.4.2014 because the Court will not rise to the occasion that a litigant has been sleeping over his or her right when the violence took place.

Any interference or encouragement to such litigant will not be allowing indulgence to unsettle the matter which has already been settled because the people has already been selected and working for the past eight years now.

In addition to that, nothing serious as such has been pointed out which should be considered by the Court or Tribunal for setting aside the selection already made.

Writ has no merit. It is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

Surendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--