

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7436 of 2017

- =====
1. Akhil Bhartiya Takniki Yuva Chhatra Sangh, Near H.P. Gas Godown, Vikas Nagar, Kurji, District- Patn through its National President, Anubhav Raj, son of Shri Devendra Ray, resident of At- Sundarpur, P.O.- Karauta, P.S.- Salimpur, District- Patna.
 2. Khushboo Kumari, daughter of Shri Baidya Nath Roy, resident of Village- Deshrajpur, Ward No. 22, P.O.+ P.S.- Mahnar, District- Vaishali.
 3. Asshish Ranjan, son of Shri Devendra Ray, resident of At- Sundarpur, P.O.- Karauta, P.S.- Salimpur, District- Patna.
 4. Hari Om, Son of Baidyanath Singh, resident of Village+ P.O.- Tarari, P.S.- Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad.
 5. Akanksha Kumari, daughter of Shri Awadh Kishore Chaurasia, resident of At- Pitanjhia, P.O.- Jamalpur Gogri, P.S.- Gogri, District- Khagaria.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. Principal Secretary, Science and Technology Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna through its Secretary
4. Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.
5. Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhinav Srivastava, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Md.Nashrul Hoda Khan-SC1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL JUDGMENT

2 19-05-2017 The petitioners have been disqualified on age grounds.

Considering that the last date for submission of application form is 8.5.2017 and the petitioners have luxuriously chosen to move this Court after expiry of the date coupled with fact that no application form was submitted by the petitioners as informed by Mr. Sanjay Pandey learned counsel for the Commission and admitted by Mr. Abhinav Srivastava learned counsel for the



petitioner, no case for indulgence made out.

The advertisement is dated 3.3.2017 when the petitioners herein were within full knowledge as regarding the ineligibility clause of the Advertisement yet they never chose to take legal recourse within stipulated time rather have luxuriously filed the writ petition. The delayed action does not persuade this court to exercise extra ordinary writ jurisdiction for a vigilant litigant is a sine quo non for seeking remedy under such jurisdiction.

The writ petition is dismissed.

Bibhash/-

(Jyoti Saran, J)

U			
---	--	--	--

