

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.1956 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11749 of 2013

=====

Motiur Rahman Ansari Son Of Late Mohammad Siddique Ansari Resident Of
Village - Akhtiyarpur, Post Garkha, P.S. Garkha, District - Saran, Chapra
... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, The Science and Technology Department
Government Of Bihar, Patna
3. The Deputy Secretary, The Science and Technology Department Government
Of Bihar, Patna
4. The Bihar Public Service Commission, Through Its Chairman Bailey Road,
Patna
5. The Chairman, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna null
null
6. The Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna
7. The Deputy Secretary, Bihar Public Service Commission, Bailey Road, Patna
8. Sri Ravindra Lal Son Of Sri Lakhan Lal Resident Of Village - Nijamuddinpur,
Post And P.S. And District - Jehanabad

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Shubh Narain Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to AAG 6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
and
HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

5 07-03-2018 Heard counsel for the appellant and counsel for the State.

Perused the order of the learned Single Judge dated
06.09.2016. The learned Single Judge opined as under in
paragraph 12 of the impugned order :

*“12. Having considered the aforesaid facts, this
Court is of the view that when Ravindra Lall has been
deprived of his appointment, it can be best for
Ravindra Lall to challenge his non- selection, the*



petitioner is the third one in the recommendation, he does not have any right to challenge the action of the respondents for and on behalf of Ravindra Lall. Further, advertisement in question is of the year 1999 already 17 years have passed, so much so that Ravindra Lall has not shown any interest in challenging the action of the respondents- authority, in such a situation, it will not be proper to give direction for appointment of the petitioner after such a long delay.”

Reason provided for dismissing the writ application and refusing to pass any order in favour of the present appellant, who was the petitioner, cannot be said to be suffering from any error.

Appeal has no merit. It is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

(Nilu Agrawal, J)

sk

U			
---	--	--	--

