

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 20301 of 2011

=====

Md. Khalil Ahamad son of Late Md. Sabrati Resident of Mohalla- New Chhoti Maszid (Khelal Toli), P.O.- Bhuniyadganj, P.S. - Muffasil, District – Gaya.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. Administration, Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, Sultan Palace, Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
2. Divisional Manager, Bankipur Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, Church Road, Gaya.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Sinha
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar Verma
Miss Divya Verma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4. 23-05-2017 Heard Sri Arun Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner and Miss Divya Verma, learned counsel, who has appeared on behalf of respondent/Bihar State Road Transport Corporation (hereinafter referred to as ‘Corporation’).

The petitioner, who superannuated as Conductor w.e.f. 30-11-2004, has approached this Court invoking its writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, with a prayer to direct the respondents to grant him Time Bound Promotion.

At the very outset, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/Corporation has raised preliminary objection on the point that the writ petition is primarily required to be



rejected on the ground of limitation itself, since the petitioner superannuated in the year 2004 and the present writ petition was filed in the year 2011. She has also produced a copy of order passed by a Bench of this Court dated 06-04-2015 in C.W.J.C. No. 105 of 2015 on the point that in the Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, none of the employees was ever given benefit of Time Bound Promotion. The said policy was already withdrawn by the State Government long back in the year 1996 and it was never implemented thereafter in the Corporation. Let the copy of order dated 06-04-2015 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 105 of 2015 be kept on record.

Considering the fact that the issue, raised in the present writ petition, has already been set at rest and such relief has been negated, there is no reason to pass any favourable order.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--

