

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3915 of 2015

=====

Ram Sagar Singh son of Late Jaddu Singh , permanent resident of village Bijuliya , P.S. Shamho, District Begusarai, presently resident of Ward No. 8, Karyanand Nagar , Lakhirarai, P.S. Lakhisarai, District- Lakhisarai. **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary , Government of Bihar, Patna.
 2. The Commissioner , Munger, Division, Munger.
 3. The District Magistrate cum Collector, Lakhisarai
 4. The District Development Commissioner Lakhisarai.
 5. The Additional District Magistrate, Lakhisarai.
 6. The District Najarath Officer, Lakhisarai.
 7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Lakhisarai.
 8. The Block Development Officer, Lakhisarai **Respondents**
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Om Prakash Maharaj, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. AC to SC 22

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 13-08-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to advertisement in the year 2002 petitioner's name was considered for appointment as a driver in the District of Lakhisarai. It is submitted that the petitioner's name was in the panel prepared for appointment. It is his case that many others whose name appeared in the said panel were appointed pursuant to the different orders passed by this Court in several writ petitions. All the orders relied upon by the petitioner and placed on the record have been passed in the writ petitions filed much prior to the instant writ petition.



Case of the respondent State in the counter affidavit is that 12 out of 13 sanctioned posts have been filled up and by now 1 post remains and that the roster prepared in 2001 is not in force. It is also submitted by leaned counsel for the State that in 2012 the process for selection of driver has been changed and now it is being done by Bihar Karmchari Chayan Aayog.

In view of these developments subsequent to year 2012, prayer made in the writ petition is not worthy of consideration. The writ petition is not only barred by delay in lapse of about 16 years, but also because of latches on the part of the petitioner giving rise to coming into force the new rule of appointment.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

Shashi.

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16.8.2018
Transmission Date	NA

