

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.351 of 2017

=====

Pankaj Priyadarshi, son of Rajpati Narayan, Resident of Village- Raghunathpur, Ward No.5, P.O.- Siddhipur, Block- Paliganj, P.S.- Khiri More, Sub Division- Paliganj, District- Patna, presently residing at C/o Rajpati Narayan, Near A.B.V.P. School (North of Dr. Anil Kumar Pandey, I.P.S.), Mohalla- Buddha Colony, P.S.- Buddha Colony, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Consumer Protection, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Bihar State Food & Civil Supply Corporation Limited through its Nodal Officer, At- C/o B.C.E.C.E. Board, I.A.S. Bhawan, Near Patna Airport, P.O.- B.V. College, Patna- 800014.
5. The Nodal Officer, Bihar State Food & Civil Supply Corporation Limited, C/o B.C.E.C.E. Board, I.A.S. Bhawan, Near Patna Airport, P.O.- B.V. College, Patna- 800014.
6. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food & Civil Supply Corporation Limited at Daroga Rai Path, Patna, District- Patna.
7. The Controller of Examination, Bihar Combined Entrance Competitive Examination Board, Patna at I.A.S. Bhawan, Near Patna Airport, P.O.- B.V. College, Patna- 800014.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey No-5, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Maruth Nath Roy, AC to SC9
For the Corporation : Mr. Aditya Prakash Sahay, Adv.
For BCECS : Mr. Vikas Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 07-04-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

An advertisement of the year 2015 is sought to be complained against in view of the resolution dated 3.9.2015 seeking to extend the benefits to the children and grand children of freedom fighter in public employment.

The petitioner has awoken from slumber a bit late when



the selection process of the advertisement of the year 2015 has been completed in the year 2016. Whatever be the nature of inter party dispute arising from that selection process, in so far as enforcement of the benefit and a policy decision of the State is concerned, the petitioner should have chosen to knock the forum at appropriate time. Another relevant aspect of the matter is that the resolution being relied upon was enforced after the advertisement was published by the Corporation.

On either of the issues, no cause for indulgence is made out. The writ petition is dismissed.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Surendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

